DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 338 CE 055 441

TITLE	New Opportunities. Volume IV: July, 1988-June, 1989. A Collection of Essays: Recommendations Related to Education in General and Vocational-Technical Education in Particular.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Raleigh.
PUB DATE	May 90
NOTE	150p.; For the other volumes in this series, see CE 055 438-442.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Compliance (Legal); Cost Effectiveness; Curriculum Development; Economic Development; Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Electronics; Federal Legislation; Institutional Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Program Improvement; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; *State Boards of Education; *State Legislation; *State Programs; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This is the fourth of five volumes of essays in the form of recommendations for the improvement of programs, services, and activities offered through vocational-technical education in North Carolina. The volume explains the rationale for and comments on 21 recommendations prepared by the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education for fiscal year July 1988-June 1989. Topics covered by the 21 resolutions are the following: (1) vocational teacher education; (2) reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act; (3) transfer of credit from community colleges; (4) enhancing the role of vocational education; (5) a new procedure for student census; (6) improving teacher qualifications; (7) need for an independent study of proprietary schools; (8) appropriate funding for community colleges; (9) new procedures for weighing full-time student equivalents; (10) vocational student organizations; (11) vocational education and economic development; (12) military contributions to the electronics curriculum; (13) textbook adoptions; (14) state administration of education; (15) a combined plan for vocational teacher education; (16) administering student financial aid through a single agency; (17) meeting college purposes; (18) mission statement; (19) appointing business/industrial leaders to State Board of Education; (20) evaluation of state compliance with Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and Job Training Partnership Act; and (21) establishment of vocational-technical honor societies. (KC)

ED322338

A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS:
Recommendations Related to Education in General
and Vocational-Technical Education in Particular

VOLUME IV:
JULY, 1988 - JUNE, 1989

NEW OPPORTUNITIES

Developed by
The North Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education
530 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27604-1198
919/733-2064

E. Michael Latta, Executive Director

CE055441

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

May, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EMLatta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

Preface vi

Introduction vii

Recommendations: Section

(1) A WHITE PAPER: THE RESULTS OF THE DECLARATIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ABOUT VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION OVER THE LAST DECADE ADDS UP TO BE ADMINISTRATIVE "BENIGN NEGLECT" BY THE OFFICIALS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 1

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 98-524, AS AMENDED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION 2

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education Recommends ...

(3) ... That the Board of Governors Adopt the Following Policy (or one similar) for the Constituent Institutions of the University: Any North Carolina Resident Presenting Evidence Indicating That an Associate Degree Has Been Earned at One of the Community Colleges in the State Will be Admitted to One of the Constituent Institutions and All Credits Will Be Acceptable in the Program Area to Which the Student is to Be Admitted 3

(4) ... That the Governor Convene a Joint Conference of All of the Education and Training Agencies to Explain and Enhance the Role of Vocational Education in the Academic Curriculum and in Economic Development 4

(5) ... That the State Board of Community Colleges Adopt a New Procedure for Counting Students Enrolled in Community Colleges so as to Provide, at Minimal Cost, Timely Data for Planning and Budgeting 5

(6) ... That the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges Establish as a Policy, in Addition to All Other Requirements Set by These Boards, That All Full-Time Vocational or Technical Faculty Members Be Required to Secure the Appropriate *Trade License* Before Being Employed With Federal or State Funds 6

(7) ... That the State Board of Community Colleges, in Collaboration With the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, Employ an "Independent, Outside Consultant" to Conduct a Study of Proprietary (for Profit) Schools in the State. 7

(8) ... That the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) Establish as a Standing Policy Achieving and Maintaining for the Community Colleges in North Carolina the National Median Expenditure Per Credit Hour Full-Time Student Equivalent Enrollment in Vocational/Technical Colleges, and That the SBCC Seek a Resolution From the General Assembly to the End of Accepting This Policy as a Goal for the State. 8

Recommendations: **Section**

(9) ... That the State Board of Community Colleges Adopt a New Procedure (described herein) for Weighting Full-Time Student Equivalents for the Purposes of Making Budget Requests to the General Assembly for and Fund Allocations to the Community Colleges.. 9

(10) ... That the State Board of Education Conduct a Statewide Assessment of the Vocational Student Organizations.. 10

(11) ... That the Local Directors of Vocational Education Invite the North Carolina Industrial Developers Association (NCIDA) to a Meeting to Explain the Role of Secondary Vocational Education in Economic Development and for the State Board of Education to Encourage the State Division of Vocational Education to Support This Type of Meeting With NCIDA As Well As Other Associations/Organizations of Like Kind.. 11

(12) ... That the State Board of Education Request a Briefing on the Role the Military Has Played and Continues to Play in Improving the Electronics Curriculum in the Public Schools and the Role the Military is Projected to Play in Enhancing Math and Science in the Immediate Future... 12

(13) ... That the State Board of Education (SBE) Propose to the General Assembly At Least the Changes Under Strategy #1 (below) in the State Laws Regarding "Textbooks" and That the SBE Request Its Study Committee for Textbook Adoption Process and Procedures to Consider the Questions Proposed Under Strategy #2 (below)...................... 13

(14) ... That the Governor Request the General Assembly to Enact Legislation That Would Assign the Functions of the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Governors to the State Board of Education and for the Members of the State Board of Education to Hold Full-Time, State-Paid Positions.. 14

(15) ... That the State Board of Education (SBE), the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC), and the Board of Governors of the University (BG-UNC) Develop a Combined Plan Which Will Address the Preparation of Vocational-Technical Teachers Now and in the Future and Present the Funding of the Combined Plan to the General Assembly, if Necessary.. 15

(16) ... to the State Board of Education, to the State Board of Community Colleges, to the Board of Governors, and to the North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities That They Each Endorse the Concept That All of the State-Administered Student Financial Aid Programs Be Brought Together Into One Agency..... 16

(17) ... That the State Board of Community Colleges certify Annually to the General Assembly, to Each Local Board of Trustees, and to the General Public the Status of Each Community College Institution in Meeting the Major Purpose Set Forth in the Community College Act, Section 115D-1.. 17

Recommendations: Section

(18) ... That the Recently Elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction Recommend the Attached "Mission Statement" to the State Board of Education for Its Consideration. 18

(19) Letter to Governor Martin, 2/17/89:

... it would be desirable for you to appoint business and/or industrial leaders to fill the two positions on the State Board of Education.

... The Council recommends that you appoint or reappoint individuals with strong business and/or industrial interest in this state (to the SBCC)........ 19

(20) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY from the *Biennial Review of North Carolina's Achievement in Accomplishing the Purposes of the Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act 1986-1988* 20

(21) ... The State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges to Urge Local Public Secondary Schools and Community Colleges, Respectively, to Consider the Possibility of Establishing a "National Vocational-Technical Honor Society" at Each Institution........ 21

PREFACE

One of the duties of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education is to give advice to the Governor, the business community, the general public and to the state's education boards on what might be done to improve the quality of programs, services and activities offered through vocational education. In implementing this assignment of federal law under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, P.L. 98-524, as amended, the State Advisory Council has issued a number of recommendations over its existence of twenty years.

The rationale for each recommendation of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, by fiscal year since 1985-86, has been compiled. This is the fourth of five volumes of essays in the form of recommendations that have been organized by topic and printed in one place. It should be noted, however, that an earlier document under the title *A Compendium of Reports, Policy Statements, Studies, and Other Activities Since 1969* was issued in July, 1986. The document includes all of the recommendations from 1970, when the State Advisory Council issued its first Annual Report, to 1985 as well as responses to the recommendations, if known.

The members of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education and I hope those who read this volume will benefit from that experience.

E. Michael Latta
May, 1990

INTRODUCTION

While there is no legal obligation for the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education to do so, an annual report is published at the end of each fiscal year. In each annual report, the recommendations of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education for that particular fiscal year are included. However, the full rationale for the recommendations are not included. The purpose of this volume is to bring together each recommendation for a specified fiscal year along with the rationale for each recommendation.

This volume covers fiscal year July, 1988 - June, 1989, under the annual report title of *New Opportunities*.

SECTION 1

Are our universities getting the job done?

A WHITE PAPER:

THE RESULTS OF THE DECLARATIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ABOUT VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION OVER THE LAST DECADE ADDS UP TO BE ADMINISTRATIVE "BENIGN NEGLECT" BY THE OFFICIALS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

by

E. Michael Latta
Executive Director

Adopted and Issued by the
State Advisory Council on Vocational Education
August 26, 1988

An essential purpose of the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina, hereinafter called "The University," is to prepare teachers for the public schools as well as for other educational institutions in the state. Currently, The University is not training the number of teachers and other professional personnel needed by the public schools as well as those educators needed in the other educational institutions in the state.

There are several methods available to individuals who desire to be certified to teach in the public schools of North Carolina. For example, Attachment I shows the available methods, among which is the "Approved Program" category for professional personnel -- a category established by the State Board of Education for the "approved" teacher education programs offered by the private colleges and universities in the state as well as by the constituent institutions of The University. The number and percentage of professionals certified through the "Approved Program" category have declined from 2,958 or sixty-two (62%) percent in 1982 to 2,090 or forty-two (42%) percent in 1987 (according to data provided by the Department of Public Instruction of the State Board of Education). For vocational education personnel, the number of and the percentage of individuals for "special vocational" approval, however, increased from 120 (2.5%) percent in 1982 to 208 (4.2%) percent in 1987.

The Board of Governors of The University was established in 1971 by the General Assembly and began to legally function on July 1, 1972. One provision of the 1971 enabling legislation declares:

> The Board of Governors shall plan and develop a coordinated system of higher education in North Carolina. To this end, it shall govern the sixteen (16) constituent institutions, ... and to this end it shall maintain close liaison with the State Board of Education, the Department of Community Colleges and the private colleges and universities of the State. The Board, in consultation with representatives of the State Board of Education and of the private colleges and universities, shall prepare and from time to time revise a long-range plan for a coordinated system of higher education ....

Planning for a coordinated system of higher education, therefore, is an important function of the Board of Governors of The University.

Planning Declarations.

The first Long-Range Plan, 1976-1981 of The University was adopted by the Board of Governors on November 11, 1977. The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," noted in its 1976 Annual Report entitled A CALL FOR POLICY, that the Long-Range Plan, 1976-1981 of the Board of Governors recognized an imbalance between the market demand for teachers and the kind of training and services being carried on by the constituent institutions. However, no specific attention was given to the special needs of vocational/technical education teachers who were employed or who were to be employed by the public schools as well as by the community colleges and other education agencies. In November 1977, the Board of Governors took a major step forward in correcting this oversight when it included a statement on vocational education in its adopted Long-Range Plan, 1977-1982. The statement reads in part:

> Occupational education comprises an important aspect of North Carolina's public education program. It is also an important component of federal policy.
> In the "Vocational Education" State Plan, the State Board of Education notes the necessity for University contributions

> to an effective program of occupational education. In particular, it is pointed out that the University institutions have major responsibilities in providing needed programs in such areas as health occupations and in the teaching of the disadvantaged and handicapped, and in preparing -- through preservice and in-service programs -- teachers; counselors; supervisors; and other school personnel.
>
> As planning in this area (Vocational Education) proceeds, the Board of Governors will continue to cooperate with and seek the advice of the State Board of Education in determining how University contributions can most effectively be made (pp. 283-284).

The Board of Governors of The University reiterated this policy in its Long-Range Plan, 1978-83 and further stated "The Board will also continue to value the advice and assistance of ... [The] ... Council ... as it continues to advocate improved programs of vocational education" (p. 237). The above policy provision on vocational education and the reference to The Council, however, were not contained in the Long-Range Plan, 1980-85. In a February 1981 response to a written inquiry from The Council about these matters, the Vice President for Planning of the General Administration for the Board of Governors of The University wrote "the omission of the section to which you refer does not mean that the Board of Governors is no longer cognizant of the value and necessity of the programs mentioned there." The Long-Range Plan, 1982-87 of the Board of Governors, nonetheless, did not consider the special needs for vocational education teachers. Regarding this lack of specific attention to vocational education in the Long-Range Plan, 1982-87, two associate vice presidents for academic affairs wrote in February 1984 that a "... statement referring to the State Plan for Vocational Education in that document and reaffirming the university's role as set forth in that document would be appropriate for the next and subsequent editions of the Long-Range Plan" (underlining for emphasis). Notwithstanding this written statement, neither the Long-Range Plan 1984-89 nor the Long-Range Plan, 1986-1991 has any special reference about planning for vocational education.

Results of the Planning Declarations.

CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS HAVE PROVIDED A WRITTEN STATEMENT ABOUT REFERENCING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE "Subsequent Editions" OF THE LONG-RANGE PLAN OF THE UNIVERSITY THAT HAS NOT BEEN ACHIEVED!

Study Declarations.

In 1977, a "Quality of Teacher Education Study," or Teacher Education Review Program (TERP) as it was known, was initiated by the Board of Governors of The University. A key finding for that study, as reported in the Long-Range Plan, 1977-82, was:

> The study clearly indicated no basis for further expansion of teacher education programs in the university at this time or for the foreseeable future. Some specific areas of high demand do remain (e.g., reading education, special education, vocational education ...) and institutions were advised to reallocate their resources to expand productivity in these areas while decreasing productivity of areas of oversupply (p. 252-253). (Emphasis added.)

As noted, the above statement advised the constituent institutions of The University to reallocate their resources to expand in the identified areas of shortage such as in vocational education.

At the May 1982 meeting of the Board of Governors, a document entitled Industrial Arts, Vocational and Technical Education, and Engineering Technology Programs was reviewed. While no recommendations were offered, the report did contain two conclusions. One conclusion was that the report "... served as a means to make a general assessment of the adequacy of existing degree program offerings" (p. 6-4). As to extensiveness of offerings, the report revealed that "the enrollment declines noted in programs in industrial arts and vocational and technical education at the undergraduate level ... are cause for concern" (underlining for emphasis) (p. 6-4). Enrollment levels in these programs were to be monitored over the next two years to see if some "specific action is needed." In a 1984 follow-up to the 1982 report that was conducted by an official of the General Administration of The University, but which was requested by The Council, some modest enrollment increases were found in five of the six public teacher training institutions from the Fall 1980 to the Fall 1984 and that the number of degrees conferred increased slightly at five of the six public institutions. (See Attachment II, provided by an official of the General administration for the Board of Governors. It is important for a reader to be aware that the definition of a vocational teacher education program by The University is not consistent with the definition by the Department of Education of the State Board of Education or by the Department of Community Colleges, State Board of Community Colleges. The University definition included only those programs on Attachment II. See also Attachment III, page 2, item #3.)

To facilitate a continuing relationship and to improve teacher education in general, the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors adopted (in October 1978) a Concurring Resolution entitled QUALITY ASSURANCE FOR PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL. Several steps were taken to develop the Quality Assurance Program (QAP). A special liaison committee was appointed by the State Board of Education to guide the development of the QAP. A final QAP Report was presented to the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors in October 1981. The final QAP Report identified ten (10) "Policy and Procedural Changes" that needed further attention in order for QAP to have the desired impact on the education system in the state. One of those identified "policy and procedural changes" was:

> Additional study must be addressed to the particular problem of certification of Trade and Industrial teachers within the general field of vocational education.
>
> The specialty area has not been addressed adequately because of the complexity of the matter and because of certain dissimilarities in the identification and employment of trade

> and industrial teachers in comparison with all other teaching specialties.
>
> An effort should be made to solve this problem and might best be undertaken in close cooperation with the Department of Community Colleges (pp. 48-49).

The Results of This Study Declaration.

SEVEN YEARS AFTER THIS NEED WAS IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY, IN CONCERT WITH THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, IT HAS YET TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

More Study Declarations.

The General Assembly of 1985 directed the Board of Governors of The University to conduct a study of the teacher preparation programs in the state. The language mandating the study reads, in part, as follows:

> It is essential to maintain the highest quality teacher education programs in order to enhance the competence of professional school personnel certified in North Carolina. Colleges of education have the responsibility to lead the State toward effective reform in teacher education; therefore, the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina is directed to study:
> (1) Ways to upgrade teacher preparation programs to make the course of study more rigorous and more effective;
> (2) Standards for institution-based innovative and experimental programs;
> (3) Standards for implementing consortium-based teacher education;
> (4) Standards for improved efficiencies in the administration of teacher education programs; and
> (5) Areas of potential teacher shortage and oversupply in the next 10 years.

The language of the General Assembly clearly required the Board of Governors to study "ways to upgrade teacher preparation programs to make the course of study more rigorous and more effective, to study "areas of potential teacher shortage and oversupply in the next 10 years," and to study "standards for innovative and experimental programs" (underlining for emphasis). What were the results of this study in regard to vocational education teacher preparation?

A final report was approved by the Board of Governors on November 14, 1986 under the heading, The Education of North Carolina's Teachers. The report, in addition to providing the cost of implementation, contained thirty-nine recommendations. Several findings, reported in The Education of North Carolina's Teachers Report, related to vocational education teachers, are:

- In 1985-86, fourteen percent of the teachers in the public schools taught vocational education (pp. 33-34);
- Fields which are likely to experience above average shortage of teachers include "vocational business education" and "vocational handicapped" (pp. 42-43); and
- "Vocational handicapped" teachers in an area that is "likely to experience severe shortages" (p. 43).

What was not in the above-referenced report is as significant! In another report entitled Teacher Supply and Demand in North Carolina Public Schools: 1986-1995, prepared by the staff of the General Administration for the Board of Governors, identified the supply and demand needs for teachers. This document revealed some similar findings to The Education of North Carolina's Teachers Report as well as some additional facts about vocational education. Examples are:

- Overall, 266 fewer vocational education teachers will be needed by 1990-91, a decrease of 5 percent since 1985-86 (p. 12);
- New hires for vocational education will decrease from 9 to 6 percent (p. 17);
- When all factors are considered vocational education teachers are not projected for growth in the coming years, meaning through 1995, (p. 27); and
- Shortages are, however, projected in business education, health occupations, and vocational education of the handicapped. "Teachers of trade and industry, prevocational courses and health occupations do not need a college degree to teach or be certified and are therefore not included on this [shortage] list," (underlining for emphasis) (p. 55).

The Report, prepared by the administrative staff of the Board of Governors, that was forwarded to the General Assembly left out "teachers of trade and industry, prevocational courses and health occupations" because they "...

do not need a college degree to teach or be certified and are therefore not included on this [shortage] list (underlining for emphasis).

THE STUDIES CITED HEREIN DID NOT ADEQUATELY STUDY OR RECOMMEND TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SOLUTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

The first recommendation in The Education of North Carolina's Teachers was:

> That all undergraduate teacher education students in early childhood education, elementary education, middle grades education, special education, and all other education degree programs also complete a second major in one of the basic academic disciplines or an interdisciplinary major.

The Board of Governors has called upon all of the constituent institutions to be in compliance by July 1, 1990.

This action by the Board of Governors to require a "second major in one of the basic academic disciplines or an interdisciplinary major" is not consistent with action taken by the State Board of Education. Notwithstanding the fact that the two major education boards are not in agreement on the required "second major," the Senior Vice President of the General Administration (in a memorandum under date of May 2, 1988 -- see Attachment III), has concluded that certain fields of study are exempt from the "second major" requirements while certain fields are not to be exempted. Notably upon those not to be exempted are: agricultural education, business, commerce and distributive education, and industrial, vocational and technical education.

THE RESULTS OF THIS ACTION IS LIKELY TO CAUSE EVEN GREATER SHORTAGES IN THE FIELD OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Declarations by the Current President and the President Emeritus of The University.

In a speech on September 9, 1987 in Charlotte, the current President had this to say about vocational education in the high schools: "... students shouldn't spend their precious high school years learning skills ..." (p. 8).

In a speech on March 16, 1988 in Raleigh, the President Emeritus said the state should be about "... maintaining an adequate secondary vocational program ..." (p. 13).

Results of These Declarations.

EVEN THOUGH THE CURRENT PRESIDENT HAS STATED THAT STUDENTS IN HIGH SCHOOL SHOULD NOT BE LEARNING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION "SKILLS," DURING THE 1987-88 SCHOOL YEAR THERE ARE OVER 100 VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATORS EMPLOYED BY THE CONSTITUENT INSTITUTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY PREPARING STUDENTS TO BECOME VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND OTHER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL. MOREOVER, EVEN THOUGH THE PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE UNIVERSITY HAS DECLARED HIS SUPPORT FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, THE ACTIONS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, AS REVEALED IN THIS PAPER, INDICATES "ON-AGAIN, OFF-AGAIN" ADMINISTRATIVE EFFORTS TO IMPROVE VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION DURING HIS TENURE AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Summary.

During the last half of 1986, at least eight different studies were issued in this state by various agencies and organizations related to vocational education. Most of the eight studies provided recommendations to improve education in general and vocational education in particular. One study, prepared for the General Assembly, called for improving the training for vocational education teachers. This study entitled The Vocational Education Study, conducted by the Research Triangle Institute, recommended that "... the undergraduate or graduate degree requirements of vocational education teachers [be made] similar to the requirement for other teachers" (p. 61). The Council agreed with this recommendation, having made similar recommendations during earlier times. Moreover, the recommmendations of The Vocational Education Study were similar to those that were first recommended by the Board of Governors in 1978 as a part of its

Quality Assurance Program (QAP), in concert with the State Board of Education. However, this paper shows that officials of the General Administration of the Board of Governors have taken an "on again, off again" approach to improving vocational teacher education. The evidence of this paper shows that, when the constituent institutions of The University have been directed by the Board of Governors to emphasize vocational teacher education, limited results of that direction are evident. Indeed, certain officials of the Board of Governors of The University have provided a written statement in regard to planning for vocational education that has not been achieved. Even after the Board of Governors was directed in 1985 to study the preparation of teachers in the state, university administrators, on their own initiative, left certain vocational education fields out of the study. It is thereby concluded by The Council that the Results of the Declarations of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina about Vocational Teacher Education Over the Last Decade Adds Up to Be Administrative "Benign Neglect" by Officials of the General Administration.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
PERSONNEL SERVICES
DIVISION OF CERTIFICATION

NORTH CAROLINA CERTIFIED PERSONNEL

By fiscal year of entry and program code
identifying authority under which certificate was issued

	1981 %	1982 %	1983 %	1984 %	1985 %	1986 %	1987 %
NC Approved Program	3345-59.2%	2958-62.4%	2824-61.1%	3065-60.0%	2135-50.7%	3034-52.8%	2090-42.2%
Equivalent Certification Programs and previously certified personnel returning to active status	193-3.4%	100-2.1%	115-2.5%	169-3.3%	181-4.3%	163-2.8%	175-3.5%
Reciprocity	1974-35%	1564-3.3%	1584-34.2%	1793-34.9%	1736-41.2%	2248-39.2%	2231-45.1%
Special Vocational	137-2.4%	120-2.5%	101-2.2%	108-2.1%	144-3.4%	98-1.7%	208-4.2%
Lateral Entry	1-0%	0-0%	2-0%	4-0%	14-.4%	200-3.5%	246-5.0%
TOTALS	5650-100%	4742-100%	4626-100%	5139-100%	4210-100%	5743-100%	4950-100%

Percentage of total column rounded to nearest whole number.

10/23/87
VBM/vl

Attachment II

Table 1

Upper Division Undergraduate ENROLLMENT
Industrial Arts, Vocational and Technical Education Programs
Fall 1980 to Fall 1984

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM TRACK		1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
ASU	Industrial arts (general)		N/A	N/A	N/A	73	48
	Industrial arts, secondary education)		N/A	N/A	N/A	40	24
		Total	138	104	113	113	72
ECU	Technical education (teaching)		3	3	4	1	0
	Industrial & technical education (teaching)		85	87	94	53	44
	Industrial & technical education (non-teaching)		6	5	4	4	2
	Industrial technical (professional)		230	313	312	348	364
		Total	324	408	414	404	410
ECSU	Industrial arts education, secondary		22	16	16	12	20
	Industrial technology		23	27	44	39	51
		Total	45	43	60	51	71
NCA&TSU	Industrial technology (non-teaching)		-	-	-	-	420
	Industrial arts education		19	22	32	36	24
	Vocational industrial education		19	24	24	47	48
		Total	38	46	56	83	492
NCSU	Industrial arts education		55	70	66	58	50
	Vocational industrial education		49	35	26	20	20
	Technical education		9	9	6	6	15
		Total	113	114	98	84	85
WCU	Industrial arts education		31	33	18	21	34
	Industrial technology		229	251	235	207	177
	Occupational education		1	8	1	2	13
	Industrial distributive		2	6	8	21	41
		Total	263	298	262	251	265

Table 2

#2 of Attachment II

Baccalaureate Degrees Conferred
Industrial Arts, Vocational and Technical Education Programs

1979-80 to 1983-84

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM TRACK	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
ASU	Industrial arts (general)	59	38	44	49	40
	Industrial arts, secondary education	23	21	17	17	24
	Total	82	59	61	66	64
ECU	Technical education (teaching)	2	0	1	3	0
	Industrial & technical education (teaching)	24	13	28	20	13
	Industrial & technical education (non-teaching)	1	1	0	1	0
	Industrial technical (professional)	37	58	61	109	137
	Total	64	72	90	133	150
ECSU	Industrial arts education, secondary	9	10	10	4	6
	Industrial technology	12	9	7	15	16
	Total	21	19	17	19	22
NCA&TSU	Industrial technology (non-teaching)	61	77	52	78	78
	Industrial arts education	5	7	1	2	7
	Vocational industrial education	3	4	5	6	8
	Total	69	88	58	86	93
NCSU	Industrial arts education	14	6	7	10	22
	Vocational industrial education	0	1	2	0	0
	Technical education	10	10	12	7	4
	Total	24	17	21	17	26
WCU	Industrial arts education	10	6	9	4	2
	Industrial technology	51	48	61	57	62
	Occupational education	0	0	1	2	6
	Industrial distributive	0	0	0	5	1
	Total	61	54	71	68	71

Attachment III

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
General Administration
P.O. BOX 2688
CHAPEL HILL 27515-2688

RAYMOND H. DAWSON
Vice President—Academic Affairs

TELEPHONE: (919) 962-1000

May 2, 1988

MEMORANDUM

To: EXAMPLE OF CONTACTS TO ALL UNC SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS ABOUT REQUIRING A SECOND ACADEMIC MAJOR FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

From: Raymond H. Dawson RHD

Re: "Second Major" Requirement

On a number of occasions over the last several months, we have discussed Recommendation #1 of the Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. As adopted by the Board of Governors, the recommendation states:

> **That all undergraduate teacher education students in early childhood education, elementary education, middle grades education, special education, and all other education degree programs also complete a second major in one of the basic academic disciplines or an interdisciplinary major.**

The Board has called upon all institutions to be in compliance by July 1, 1990. This memorandum reviews the current status of this new policy, and indicates what steps are now needed to meet this schedule.

1. Special faculty review panels have in recent weeks reviewed with us all undergraduate degree programs in art education, music education, mathematics education, and science education. In most instances it was found that these programs already include a major in the indicated subject area outside of education, and they therefore already satisfy the requirement. In those instances where this was not the case, the institution has been advised what steps must be taken to satisfy the new policy.

2. For undergraduate degree programs in elementary and early childhood education, in middle grades education, and in special education, plans need to be developed to meet the new policy. You have indicated that this planning is in progress. Please let me have your completed plans, indicating how the second major policy will be in effect by the time specified by the Board, by no later than **October 14, 1988**. The goal is to meet the requirement in the four-year baccalaureate model. Please use the format in Attachment A in preparing your reports. After we receive your plans, we will review them with you.

3. Other undergraduate education majors are offered at one or more institutions in these fields: (1) agricultural education, (2) business, commerce and distributive education, (3) driver and safety education, (4) health education, (5) industrial, vocational and technical education, and (6) physical education. These programs do not now meet the requirement. Please proceed now to draw up a plan to meet the second major requirement for each of these programs that you offer. The plan should be submitted by **November 15, 1988.** Here again the goal is to meet this requirement in the four-year baccalaureate model. Use the format in Attachment A for this purpose also. After we have received your draft plans, we will schedule a meeting to review them with you. Thank you for your cooperation.

An inventory of undergraduate degree programs in education subject to the "second major" requirement is provided in Attachment B.

A list of acceptable "second majors" is provided in Attachment C.

RHD/cw
Attachments
cc: President Spangler

Dr. Stedman

Appendix A

The University of North Carolina

Plan to meet the intent and requirements of Recommendation #1 of the report of the Board of Governors Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers

NOTE: A plan should be developed for each undergraduate degree program in education subject to the "second major" requirement and submitted to the UNC General Administration to be effective on July 1, 1990. Plans should follow the general format provided below.

Institution: ______________________________ Date: ____________

Education Degree Program: ______________________________

A. Current course requirements

Course #	Course Title	Semester

B. List of acceptable second majors considered as complementary to this program:

C. Proposed revision(s) in course of study to accommodate second major requirements:

Core course requirements

	Course #	Course Title	Semester Hours
Add:			
Delete:			

Recommended electives

	Course #	Course Title	Semester Hours
Add:			
Delete:			

D. Special revision plans

Coursework

Add:

Delete:

Non-credit activities

Add:

Delete:

E. Revisions in student teaching requirements

Add:

Delete:

F. Other plans or information required to explain plans.

Undergraduate Degree Programs in Education in The University of North Carolina Subject to Recommendation #1 of the Report of the Board of Governors Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers

◆ = indicates degree program; o = SDPI certificate program (10/87)

	Early Child. Education (0802)	Middle Grades Education (0804)	Special Education (0808)	Agric. Education (0101/0892)	Driv. & Saf. Education (0836)	Bus. Com. Dist. Educ. (0838)	Indust., Voc. Dist. Educ. (0839)*	Health Education (0837)	Health & Phys. Education (0835/0895)*
ASU	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o		◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o
ECU	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o		◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o
ECSU	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o			◆ o	◆ o		◆ o
FSU	◆ o		· o			◆ o			◆ o
NCA&T	◆ o		◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o		◆ o
NCCU	◆ o					◆ o		◆ o	◆ o
NCSA									
NCSU	(0801) o	◆ o		◆ o			◆ o		
PSU	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o			◆ o			◆ o
UNC-A	· o	· o							
UNC-CH	◆ o	· o	· o					· o	◆ o
UNC-C	◆ o	◆ o							
UNC-G	◆ o	◆ o	(0812) o			◆ o		◆ o	◆ o
UNC-W	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o					· o	◆ o
WCU	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o			◆ o	◆ o	◆ o	◆ o
WSSU	◆ o	· o	◆ o			◆ o			◆ o

Note:

Where institutions are authorized to offer undergraduate teacher certification programs approved by the State Board of Education without offering the corresponding undergraduate education degree program, institutions must submit plans for compliance with Recommendation #1 for degree programs to which the certification tracks are attached.

* *Teacher certification tracks only.*

(4/88 - DS)

Appendix C

Inventory of Acceptable Second Majors for Undergraduate Degree Programs in Education in The University of North Carolina

A. Discipline divisions of the Academic Program Inventory from which acceptable second majors may be drawn:

0300 - Area Studies
0400 - Biological Sciences
1000 - Fine and Applied Arts
1100 - Foreign Languages
1500 - Letters
1700 - Mathematics
1900 - Physical Sciences
2000 - Psychology
2200 - Social Sciences
4900 - Interdisciplinary Studies

B. Education degree programs acceptable as second majors if exempt themselves from the second major requirement:

0831 - Art Education
0832 - Music Education
0833 - Mathematics Education
0834 - Science Education

C. Discipline specialties considered acceptable in each institutional academic program inventory:

(List attached)

Inventory of Acceptable Undergraduate Second Majors

INSTITUTION: Options: 23

Discipline Division		Discipline Specialty	
0400	Biological Sciences	0401	Biology, general
		0402	Botany, general
		0407	Zoology, general
		0411	Microbiology
		0414	Biochemistry
1100	Foreign Languages	1102	French
		1105	Spanish
1500	Letters	1501	English, general
		1506	Speech, debate, forensic science
		1507	Creative writing
		1509	Philosophy
1700	Mathematics	1701	Mathematics, general
		1702	Statistics, math. & theoretical
1900	Physical Sciences	1902	Physics, general
		1905	Chemistry, general
		1913	Atmospheric science & meteorology
		1914	Geology
2000	Psychology	2001	Psychology, general
2200	Social Sciences	2204	Economics
		2205	History
		2207	Political science & government
		2208	Sociology
		2297	Rural sociology

SECTION 2

Improvements can be improved.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 98-524, AS AMENDED BY THE

NORTH CAROLINA COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Adopted August 26, 1988

The North Carolina Council recommends that Public Law 98-524, as amended, be further amended as follows:

- Sec. 3(c), strike "$8,000,000" and insert "$10,786,000;" strike "1985" and insert "1990;" and strike "1986 through 1989" and insert "1991 through 1994." Strike "state councils on vocational education" and insert "State Commission on Education for Employment."
- Sec. 102(b), strike out "seven percent" and insert "five percent" wherever it appears in this section.
- Sec. 111(a)(1), strike "consistent with State law, designate or establish a State board of vocational education which shall be the sole State agency responsible for the administration or the supervision of that State vocational education program. The responsibilities of the State board shall include —" and insert the following: "by state legislation, establish a state policy on vocational education. As a minimum, the state legislative policy on vocational education shall set out the governance structure for vocational education in the state. The state policy shall include —".
- Sec. 111(a)(1)(C), at the end of (C) strike ";" and insert a period.
- Sec. 111(a)(1)(C), strike "State council" and insert "State Commission."
- Sec. 111(a)(1), strike the language in (D); (E); and the complete sentence following (E).
- Sec. 111(2), strike "Each State shall include a description of any delegation of its functions under paragraph (1) in its State plan, or amendments to such plan, submitted to the Secretary." and insert "Each state shall include a description of its state policy on vocational education in its State plan to be submitted to the Secretary."
- Sec. 111(2)(b)(1), strike "within the appropriate agency established or designated by the State board under the last sentence of subsection (a)(1)" and the word "board" after the words "... assist the State."
- Sec. 111(c) and (d), strike the word "board" in the first, second, and fourth sentences.
- Prior to Sec. 112, strike the heading "State Council on Vocational Education" and insert "State Commission on Education for Employment."
- Sec. 112(a), rewrite as follows: "Each State which desires to participate in vocational education programs authorized by this Act or the Job Training

Partnership Act (P. L. 97-300), or any amendments of these Acts, for any fiscal year shall establish a State Commission, which shall be appointed by the Governor and the State Legislators as set forth in this subsection. Each State Commission shall be composed of fifteen (15) individuals, and shall be broadly representative of citizens and groups within the State having an interest in vocational education and job training. Eight (8) of the members shall be appointed by the Governor and seven (7) members shall be appointed by the State Legislature; with each member being appointed for staggered term of three (3) years. In selecting individuals to serve on the State Commission, the appointing authorities shall appoint a majority of their members from the private sector, with due consideration being given to individuals who serve on a private industry council under the Job Training Partnership Act, or on state councils established under other related federal Acts.

- Sec. 112(b), strike the word "council" and insert the word "commission."
- Sec. 112(c), strike the word "council" and insert the word "commission."
- Sec. 112(d), strike the word "council" and insert the word "commission."
- Sec. 112(d)(1), strike the language of (d)(1) and insert as follows: "Meet with the State legislature (or committees of the legislature) to establish the state's policy on vocational education and to review or refine the state's policy, as appropriate, and to meet with the state's legislators on other matters of importance to the State Commission."
- Sec. 112(d)(2), strike the word "the" and insert the word "any."
- Sec. 112(d)(4), strike the word "the" and insert the word "any."
- Sec. 112(d)(5), strike the word "the" and insert the word "any."
- Sec. 112(d)(7), strike the word "the" and insert the word "any."
- Sec. 112(d)(8), strike the words "to the State board."
- Sec. 112(d)(9)(A), strike the words "the State board" and insert "any State boards."
- Sec. 112(e), strike the word "council" and insert the word "commission."
- Sec. 112(e), after the word "Act," add this provision "without regard to any state statutes to the contrary and the State Commission is authorized to compensate individuals upon its own determination and employ individuals as is necessary to achieve the purposes of this section."
- Sec. 112(f)(1)(A), strike the phrase ", without regard to paragraph (3);" and strike the number "$120,000" and insert "$150,000;" and strike "$225,000" and insert "$500,000," adding this provision at the end of this section: ", but the grant to each State Commission under this section shall be at least equal to one (1%) percent of the state's basic grant available from this Act where generated by the formula of this Act, but no less than $150,000; with additional funds as may be made available through Sec. 423(b) and Sec. 4 (confirming amendments) of this Act."

- Sec. 112(f)(2), strike the word "council" and insert the word "commission" in the first and second sentences.

- Sec. 113(a)(1)(A), strike the word "board."

- Sec. 113(a)(2)(A), strike the words "State board" and insert "State's representatives" and strike the word "council" and insert "commission."

- Sec. 113(a)(2)(B), strike the words "board" and "board's."

- Sec. 113(b)(5), strike the word "board."

- Sec. 113(b)(10), add at the end of this section, "with the aggregate state administrative cost of these programs to be consistent with Sec. 102(b), unless the State Commission established under Sec. 112 agrees to another percentage amount."

- Sec. 113(b)(13), strike the word "board."

- Sec. 113(c)(1), strike the word "board" and insert "State Commission" for the words "state council" where they appear. Also, strike the words "State job training coordinating council, and the."

- Sec. 114(a)(2), strike the word "board."

- Sec. 114(b)(2), strike the words "with the State board" and insert the words "with the Secretary of Education" in the first sentence. Strike the word "council" where it occurs in the first sentence and insert the word "commission." The second and third sentences are rewritten as follows: "The Secretary of Education shall file a copy of the State Commission's objections along with any of his findings with the state agency filing the State Plan. The State agency shall respond to the objections of the State Commission as well as to the Secretary's findings, before the State Plan is considered for final adoption by the state agency, and before final approval is granted by the Secretary of Education."

- Sec. 115, strike the word "board" wherever it appears.

- Sec. 202, strike this section and rewrite as follows: "From the portion of the allotment of each state available from this part for each fiscal year, fifty (50%) percent shall be available to be allotted for handicapped; disadvantaged individuals; adults in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents and homemakers; individuals who are participants in programs designed to eliminate sex bias and sterotyping in vocational education; and criminal offenders who are in correctional institutions. The percentage of the fifty (50%) percent for each special population shall be determined by the state agency in consultation with the State Commission. The amount of the percentage of the funds for special populations shall be and the remainder of the grant allocation to the state each year shall be allotted between secondary and postsecondary education as determined by the State Commission, but postsecondary education shall not receive less than forty percent of the total grant."

- Sec. 203(a)(1)(A), strike the word "board" wherever it appears. Strike the number "10" and insert "a" and, in Sec. 203(2)(A), strike the number "22" and insert the word "a."

- Sec. 204, strike the word "board" wherever it appears.

- Sec. 301, strike the word "board" wherever it appears.

- Sec. 313, strike the word "board" wherever it appears.

- Sec. 323(b)(1), rewrite as follows: "The State Agency submitting the State Plan shall consult with the State Commission on Education for Employment (established under Section 112 of this Act) regarding the use of funds made available for use by the Job Training Partnership Act."

- Sec. 333, strike the word "board."

- Sec. 423(b), This Section is rewritten as follows: "Each state receiving assistance under this Act shall establish a State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (SOICC). The State Commission established under Section 112 may perform the functions of the SOICC, but when it does, there shall be an advisory group to the State Commission composed of representatives of the state education boards, the State Employment Security agency, the State Economic Development agency, the agency administering the funds for the Job Training Partnership Act, and the agency administering the vocational rehabilitation program. When the State Commission declares by its own motion that it does not desire to perform the functions of SOICC, then a SOICC shall be established comprised of the membership of the agencies aforementioned, including the State Commission. Such committee shall, with funds available to it from the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee established pursuant to Subsection (a) __".

- Sec. 502(a)(5), strike the word "council" and insert "commission"

- Sec. 502(b), strike the word "board."

- Sec. 504, strike the word "board" wherever it appears.

- Sec. 521(28), this is rewritten as follows and moved to a section preceding Section 31: "The term 'State policy on vocational education' means a legislative enactment by the state's legislature which, among other elements, prescribes the governance structure of vocational education in the state."

- Sec 521(29), strike the words "council" and insert the word "commission."

Conforming Amendments

- Sec. 4, add a provision "(i)" at the end of this section as follows: "i) Section 122 of the Job Training Partnership Act is repealed and the following inserted in its place: 'Sec. 122. The State Commission established under Sec. 112 of this Act shall perform the functions previously assigned to the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) as prescribed in P.L. 97-300, as amended. The amount of funds required to be allotted to SJTCC for its functions shall be in the future allotted to the State Commission.' "

9-15-88

SECTION 3

All education is valid!

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ADOPT THE FOLLOWING POLICY (or one similar) FOR THE CONSTITUENT INSTITUTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY:

> ANY NORTH CAROLINA RESIDENT PRESENTING EVIDENCE INDICATING THAT AN ASSOCIATE DEGREE HAS BEEN EARNED AT ONE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE STATE WILL BE ADMITTED TO ONE OF THE CONSTITUENT INSTITUTIONS AND ALL CREDITS WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN THE PROGRAM AREA TO WHICH THE STUDENT IS TO BE ADMITTED.

Adopted on August 26, 1988

There is substantial evidence for this recommendation. According to the Report of the North Carolina Commission on Jobs and Economic Growth (November 14, 1986), "... by 1990, three out of four jobs will require education or technical training beyond high school" (p. 14). Moreover, according to the Fall 1987 issue of the Occupational Outlook Quarterly entitled "Projections 2000," "The projected growth of the broad occupational groups show the increasing need for education" (p. 35). In addition, there is a shortage of teachers in identified vocational education fields. Also, fifteen (15) per cent of the currently employed faculty members in the public schools do not have earned degrees, whereas twenty-seven (27) percent of the full-time vocational-technical faculty members in community colleges have not completed a four-year degree. If the state is going to make progress in economic development as well as improving the educational quality of vocational-technical faculty members in both the public schools and community colleges, new initiatives are needed by The University.

Attached to this recommendation is Table 37 (page 65) from the latest Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, 1987-88 (April 1988), issued by The University of North Carolina. The attachment, among other data, indicates the undergraduate transfers from the community colleges to The University for the last eleven (11) years. While the transfers from the community colleges to The University increased by 3.3% from the Fall 1986 to the Fall 1987, that percentage represents only 77 students. Indeed, the undergraduate transfers have increased only slightly over the last decade from 2,203 in the Fall 1977 to 2,416 in the Fall of 1987, or only 213 students. Whether these students had earned associate degrees is not indicated in the Statistical Abstract.

The Council believes it is time to act in a positive manner to increase the transfers from the community colleges to constituent institutions of The University. Accordingly, THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ADOPT THE FOLLOWING POLICY (OR ONE SIMILAR) FOR THE CONSTITUENT INSTITUTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY: ANY NORTH CAROLINA RESIDENT PRESENTING EVIDENCE INDICATING THAT AN ASSOCIATE DEGREE HAS BEEN EARNED AT ONE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE STATE WILL BE ADMITTED TO ONE OF THE CONSTITUENT INSTITUTIONS AND ALL CREDITS WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN THE PROGRAM AREA TO WHICH THE STUDENT IS TO BE ADMITTED, provided there is space available in the program area to which the student is to be admitted.

TABLE 37.

UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFERS TO NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, FALL 1977 TO FALL 1987

Type of Institution	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987 Number	Fall 1987 % Change Over 1986
To The University of North Carolina:												
From Community Colleges[1]	2,203	2,073	2,230	2,223	2,096	2,171	2,220	2,169	2,242	2,339	2,416	3.3%
From Private Junior Colleges	909	770	753	820	753	794	712	666	586	581	492	-15.3
From The University of North Carolina	1,385	1,390	1,469	1,559	1,801	1,760	1,663	1,796	1,619	1,684	1,707	1.4
From Private Senior Institutions[2]	693	810	891	811	909	950	717	657	761	728	829	13.9
Unknown from In-State	-	-	-	-	53	28	24	14	31	28	29	3.6
From Out-of-State Institutions	1,667	1,622	1,844	1,705	1,839	1,965	1,966	2,041	1,929	2,029	1,901	-6.3
Subtotal	6,857	6,665	7,187	7,118	7,451	7,668	7,302	7,343	7,168	7,389	7,374	-0.2
To Private Senior Institutions:[2]												
From Community Colleges[1]	714	749	815	879	986	818	962	1,118	988	1,032	1,137	10.2
From Private Junior Colleges	383	344	336	314	321	263	272	265	226	196	191	-2.6
From The University of North Carolina	478	482	520	570	612	473	593	512	468	468	491	4.9
From Private Senior Institutions[2]	236	262	315	270	286	247	272	216	300	213	400	87.8
Unknown from In-State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-50.0
From Out-of-State Institutions	1,010	939	1,139	1,138	1,111	1,006	1,162	1,079	1,069	1,002	999	-0.3
Subtotal	2,821	2,776	3,125	3,171	3,316	2,807	3,261	3,190	3,051	2,913	3,219	10.5
To Community Colleges:												
From Community Colleges[1]	184	157	166	227	137	177	226	193	305	215	214	-0.5
From Private Junior Colleges	104	58	66	72	68	55	53	62	44	55	67	21.8
From The University of North Carolina	389	342	366	499	276	257	287	388	402	327	346	5.8
From Private Senior Institutions[2]	153	111	128	161	109	91	106	148	157	108	124	14.8
From Out-of-State Institutions	439	302	308	407	349	221	253	493	675	632	542	-14.2
Subtotal	1,269	970	1,034	1,366	939	801	925	1,284	1,583	1,337	1,293	-3.3
To Private Junior Colleges:												
From Community Colleges[1]	56	56	36	52	51	57	65	49	44	24	33	37.5
From Private Junior Colleges	12	8	10	7	9	13	13	14	6	6	6	-
From The University of North Carolina	51	45	44	41	34	44	47	30	22	24	28	16.7
From Private Senior Institutions[2]	10	16	19	24	17	16	25	14	16	4	11	75.0
From Out-of-State Institutions	80	65	97	99	102	89	86	63	77	47	52	10.6
Subtotal	209	190	206	223	213	219	236	170	165	105	130	23.8
TOTAL TRANSFERS TO NORTH CAROLINA INSTITUTIONS	11,156	10,601	11,552	11,878	11,919	11,495	11,724	11,987	11,967	11,744	12,016	2.3

---

[1] Includes transfers from technical institutes.
[2] Includes Bible colleges.

SECTION 4

We can make vocational education stronger by working together.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE GOVERNOR CONVENE A JOINT CONFERENCE OF ALL OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING AGENCIES TO EXPLAIN AND ENHANCE THE ROLE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM AND IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

Adopted on August 26, 1988

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," called for a statewide policy on vocational education in 1976. The General Assembly responded in 1977 by establishing a statewide legislative policy on vocational education for the public schools. Thanks to the Governor and action by the 1987 General Assembly, the basic funding for that policy will be finalized during the 1988-89 fiscal year. Earlier, the General Assembly of 1969 established the vocational education policy for the community colleges when the original Community College Act of 1963 was amended. Moreover, the Board of Governors first established its policy regarding vocational education in 1977, and its position was reiterated in the Long-Range Plan of 1978. However, its reference to vocational education has not been included in the Long-Range Plan of The University since that date.

According to the State Treasurer's Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1986-87, "... we now spend some 73 per cent of our General Fund tax monies on all levels of education" (p. 1). During the same fiscal year (1986-87), a Vocational Education Study: Final Report, commissioned for the North Carolina General Assembly by the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations, reported that "eight state agencies and two state councils were identified as having statutory responsibilities for the provision of vocational/technical education (including JTPA) in North Carolina" (p. 10). The list of agencies and councils identified in the aforementioned report is attached. In addition, the Vocational Education Study revealed that:

> Vocational/technical education also is provided by the 28 proprietary schools (17 business schools, 10 trade schools, and 1 correspondence school) licensed by the State Board of Education.* In addition, virtually every State agency is involved in vocational/technical education as it applies to their own or related agency/organization personnel (underlining for emphasis).
>
> The larger numbers of clientele are served by the Public School System (with an approximate 1985-86 unduplicated enrollment of 331,000 in vocational education) and by the Community College System (with an approximate 1985-86 enrollment of 177,000 in vocational/technical education and 231,000 in continuing education, occupational extension) (p. 11).

In view of these facts and in view of the fact that there is not an overall body in the State to assist the various state agencies in becoming aware of the role and responsibilities of the others in regard to vocational education (outside of the General Assembly), THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE GOVERNOR CONVENE A JOINT CONFERENCE OF ALL OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING AGENCIES TO EXPLAIN AND ENHANCE THE ROLE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM AND IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

---

*By action of the 1987 General Assembly, the responsibility of licensing proprietary schools was assigned to the State Board of Community Colleges.

44

Attachment

EIGHT STATE AGENCIES AND TWO STATE COUNCILS IDENTIFIED IN THE *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDY* RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING AND MONITORING VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN NORTH CAROLINA[1]

Agency	Responsibility
-- Department of Public Instruction (and local education agencies):	vocational education (grades 7-12)
-- Department of Community Colleges (and local community colleges and technical institutes):	vocational and technical education for adults
-- The University of North Carolina System:	teacher preparation
-- Department of Commerce:	JTPA programs and labor market information
-- Department of Corrections:	coordination of vocational/technical education for adults
-- Department of Labor:	apprenticeship training programs
-- Department of Human Resources:	support services
-- Department of Natural Resources and Community Development:	administration of JTPA programs
-- North Carolina State Job Training Coordinating Council:	reviewing and advising regarding JTPA programs
-- State Advisory Council on Vocational Education:	advising, consulting, and reporting

[1] Pages 10-11.

SECTION 5

To develop good programs, we need to know who we're responsible for.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE FOR COUNTING STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SO AS TO PROVIDE, AT MINIMAL COST, TIMELY DATA FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING.

Adopted on August 26, 1988

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," takes note of the fact that the Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Community Colleges has found it necessary to make estimates of numbers of full-time, equivalent enrollment of students in the fifty-eight institutions in the preparation of budget information for the 1988 Session of the General Assembly. The estimates were obtained from the respective institutions for the 1987-88 school year even though complex counting procedures and computer systems are used to handle registration of students. Moreover, final enrollment data for the spring quarter of 1986-87 was not released until March 1988, about nine months after the completion of that academic period.

The long delays in accumulating and processing student enrollment data handicap the institutions, the department, the State Board, and the legislature in planning and budgeting. The Council is aware of several efforts made over the years to speed up the student data collection process. These include setting the student census date after 20% of each quarter has elapsed rather than at the end of the academic quarter (recently changed to 50% for extension courses) and installation of specialized computer equipment in the State Department of Community Colleges and the institutions, and the use of uncounted instructional and other personnel time.

The Council believes that the time has come to adopt a new procedure for the community college system to collect student enrollment data for planning and budgeting purposes. An effective enrollment data system should have the following characteristics:

1. Yield timely data;
2. Be easily administered;
3. Low cost in money, time, equipment, and personnel;
4. Be readily auditable;
5. Afford uniformity among the fifty-eight institutions; and
6. Yield full-time student equivalent (FTSE) and enrollment data comparable to other postsecondary institutions in the state and nation (see Attachment I).

The Council believes that a student data procedure with the foregoing characteristics already exists in the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina. The University procedure could be modified for use by the community college system. The model student data procedure now used by the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina has been scandal-free as well as yielding data on a timely basis to support planning and budgeting.

Attachment II to this recommendation is a sample student enrollment counting procedure for the community college system, utilizing the elements of the student counting procedure in place for the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina. The Council believes that the sample procedure has the characteristics described earlier for an effective and timely student enrollment counting system.

Accordingly, the STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE FOR COUNTING STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SO AS TO PROVIDE, AT MINIMAL COST, TIMELY DATA FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING.

STUDENT COUNTING PROCEDURES
IN THIRTY-THREE STATE SYSTEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

- Three states of thirty-three did not provide student count procedures.
- Nearly all of the other thirty reporting states appear to use headcount figures.
- Three states of thirty (Iowa; NC; Texas) appear to use contact hours only to calculate FTSE.*
- Four states of thirty (Del.; Fla.; SC; Wyo.) appear to use credit hours for credit courses and contact hours for noncredit courses to calculate FTSE.
- One state of thirty (Idaho) appears to use credit hours for credit courses, except for the use of contact hours for vocational courses, to calculate FTSE.
- Twenty-two states of thirty appear to use credit hours (and credit hour equation) to calculate FTSE.

*Full-time Student Equivalent (FTSE)

From: Fountain and Tollefson (1988)

49

SAMPLE PROCEDURE FOR COUNTING FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENT (FTSE)

1. FTSE for each quarter in the academic year will be totaled and divided by 3 (fall, winter, spring quarters) to determine Average Annual FTSE. Summer quarter FTSE will be added (at 1/3 rate) to the average annual FTSE to encourage year-round use of facilities and other resources.
2. FTSE will be audited against the dollars collected (or charged and waived).
3. A standard refund period will be established by the State Board of Community Colleges. The quarter census of student headcount and FTSE will be made after the refund period has ended. The count will be taken from a monthly business office report.
4. Students beginning classes following the initial standard refund period will be counted in the same manner as above but in the following quarter.
5. One student shall not contribute more than one (1) FTSE student to the total number of FTSE students. See illustration below.

CURRICULUM (CREDIT HOURS)

Registered Credit Hours	Tuition Paid or Waived		FTSE
1-4	$ 6.25 - $25.00	=	1/3
5-9	$31.25 - $56.25	=	2/3
10-14 plus	$62.50 - $75.00	=	1

EXTENSION/CONTINUING EDUCATION (CLOCK HOURS)
OCCUPATIONAL

Registered Clock Hours	Fee Paid or Waived	FTSE
0-9	$ .00	0
10- 59	$ 5.00	1/3
60-119	$10.00	2/3
120-176 plus	$15.00	1

OTHER EXTENSION (OR CONTINUING EDUCATION)

10- 59	$ 7.00	1/3
60-119	$14.00	2/3
120-176	$20.00	1

EXAMPLE OF REGISTRATION FLOW OF STUDENT

Step 1, Adviser to Plan Program, and Step 2, Business Office (by machine) will:

1. Calculate fee
2. Enter Waiver code, if any
3. Accept payment from student unless waived
4. Write receipt
5. Submit FTE report

FTSE REPORT

Receipt Number	Student Number	Student Name	Program Code	Credit Hours	Dollar Charge	FTSE Waiver Code	Amount Paid
1.							
2.							
3.							
etc.							

This sample procedure as described above is solely concerned with a standard method of counting students enrolled in the Community College system. However, by weighting the FTSE according to programs, funds can be directed to high cost programs. See the following example.

Program	FTSE	Weight		Fund Base		Allocation
College Transfer	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
General Education	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Technical	1	1.5	X	$4,000	=	$6,000
Vocational	1	1.8	X	$4,000	=	$7,200
Occupational Extension	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Other Extension	1	.8	X	$4,000	=	$3,200

SECTION 6

Another measure to ensure quality ...

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ESTABLISH AS A POLICY, IN ADDITION TO ALL OTHER REQUIREMENTS SET BY THESE BOARDS, THAT ALL FULL-TIME VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL FACULTY MEMBERS BE REQUIRED TO SECURE THE APPROPRIATE TRADE LICENSE BEFORE BEING EMPLOYED WITH FEDERAL OR STATE FUNDS.

Adopted on August 26, 1988

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," has recently submitted several recommendations to the State Board of Education and to the State Board of Community Colleges about improving the quality of full-time vocational and technical faculty members. The purpose of this recommendation is to build upon these prior recommendations, notwithstanding the fact that the prior recommendations related to improving the quality of the faculty members have not been achieved to date.

The central point of this recommendation --in fact, the only point of this recommendation-- is to assure the public and the students enrolled in a vocational or technical course that the faculty member in the classroom meets the standards set by the vocational trade licensing entity, if applicable. For example, since an electrician is required to meet certain trade standards in order to offer himself/herself as an electrician to the public for hire, those same standards should be met by the faculty member in order to be employed to teach in either a public school or a community college. In other words, a person should not be employed to teach full-time if that person could not practice his/her vocation in the marketplace. Thereby, THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ESTABLISH AS A POLICY, IN ADDITION TO ALL OTHER REQUIREMENTS SET BY THESE BOARDS, THAT ALL FULL-TIME VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL FACULTY MEMBERS BE REQUIRED TO SECURE THE APPROPRIATE TRADE LICENSE BEFORE BEING EMPLOYED WITH FEDERAL OR STATE FUNDS.

SECTION 7

How good are proprietary schools?

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, IN COLLABORATION WITH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, EMPLOY AN "INDEPENDENT, OUTSIDE CONSULTANT" TO CONDUCT A STUDY OF PROPRIETARY (FOR PROFIT) SCHOOLS IN THE STATE.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

The recommendation that proprietary schools in this state should be "studied" is not a new idea. In fact, the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," made a similar recommendation in 1971 to the State Board of Education that it "... attempt some analysis of occupational education training being conducted in private schools ...." Unfortunately, the State Board of Education did not respond affirmatively to this recommendation. At that time, the State Board of Education was responsible for licensing the proprietary schools in the state. Also, at that time, the State Board of Education was responsible for establishing policy for the community colleges as well as the public schools.

Fourteen years later, the General Assembly of 1985, in its mandate that a Vocational Education Study (the name of the final report), be conducted, called for a study of proprietary schools, among the other study elements of vocational education. While the Vocational Education Study does share some useful information about Proprietary Schools in this state (page D.42 to D.46 from the study is Attachment I), these data do not constitute a study of this area of education and training in our state. Moreover, Attachment I indicates that the State Board of Education is the agency that licenses proprietary schools in the state. The 1987 General Assembly, by legislation, in fact assigned this function to the State Board of Community Colleges (G.S.115-D, Article 8). As the Vocational

Education Study reports, the Board of Governors also licenses proprietary schools that confer two-year associate degrees (G.S.116-15).

Apparently, the issue of studying proprietary schools was also considered by the Third Century Project. This Project, conducted and sponsored by the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc., issued its final report in 1987 entitled Continuing the Conversation, made no mention of proprietary schools, even though efforts were undertaken to gather data pertaining to proprietary schools in the state. In fact, a private firm in Raleigh was engaged by the Third Century Project to secure data about the nature of proprietary schools in the state. Why the data that were gathered by the private firm was not reported by the Third Century Project is not known to The Council.

What is known to The Council is that a thorough study of the proprietary schools in this state is needed at this time for at least three (3) reasons.

(1) There is a strong indication that the proprietary schools will request the General Assembly, probably in 1989, to provide state financial support to assist in underwriting their cost of operations. A headline in The News and Observer (July 10, 1988, p. 25-A; 30-A) declared: "Commercial schools to seek state money." Another headline in the same newspaper (July 17, 1988, front page; 6-A) stated that: "Commercial schools hope for grants."

Notwithstanding a statement, attributed in Forbes Magazine (November 30, 1987, p. 72) to the Vice President for Programs in the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges that 'The state is tough on proprietary schools ...', The Council believes a thorough study is needed of proprietary schools in this state if the General Assembly is likely to consider state financial support for these for profit schools. Indeed, as a News and Observer editorial of July 15, 1988 pointed out: "Commercial schools are businesses, pure and simple .... Let the schools stand or fall on the free enterprise system their owners value so highly. Tax payers shouldn't be forced to become investors in commercial enterprises." Moreover, according to the September 8, 1988 State Board of Community College Minutes (p. 9), under the heading "Proprietary Schools":

> President Scott mailed a news clipping to board members that proprietary schools are going to request the General Assembly for state assistance for tuition. He cautioned the board not to shrug this off. Whereas they may ask for $5 or $10 per student, they are concerned now about getting their foot in the door and setting a precedent. They have political knowledge and have as their attorney one of the most respected attorneys in Raleigh and one of the most respected lobbyists in the legislature. He is not their lobbyist per se, but he is their attorney. President Scott urged board members to discuss this with their legislators. If approved, this would be another slice of the educational pie and something to be considered seriously.

(2) There is some evidence to suggest that one or more of the proprietary schools may become a part of the community college system at some time in the future. Perhaps the best evidence to enhance this proposition is a review of Chapter 442 from the Session Laws of 1987. (This Chapter contains the "Proprietary Schools Law" as it was amended when the General Assembly assigned these schools, for licensure purposes, to the Department of Community Colleges and removed that duty from the State Board of Education.) Section 3 of Chapter 442, for example, contains the following sentence: "Specific authorization by the General Assembly shall be required before any proprietary school shall become a community or technical institute or part of the Community College System" (Also, see Community College Laws of North Carolina, 1987 Edition, Article 8, p. 49). Admittedly, no proprietary school has been made a part of the community college system, and there is no evidence that The Council is aware of that any proprietary school is currently seeking such, but it is a possibility, as one private college has become, by legislative enactment, a community college. Consequently, The Council believes a study of proprietary schools in the state is warranted.

(3) There is the reported "pattern of abuse" at proprietary schools, according to the United States Department of Education. In a "Media Advisory" under date of February 8, 1988, the Department of Education pointed to evidence in a study conducted by Pelavin Associates entitled Consumer Rights and Accountability in Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Education: An Exploratory Study. While The Council wishes to hasten to say that no proprietary school in this state was mentioned in this report, and it should not be inferred that any proprietary schools have any of the "problems" identified in the aforementioned report, neither is their any evidence that is readily available to say that proprietary schools in this state do not have similar problems. (For purposes of reference, the Executive Summary from the Pelavin Associates report is Attachment II to this recommendation, so the "significant problems" may be reviewed.)

Following the release of the report conducted by Pelavin Associates, a number of articles appears in various educational papers. Three examples follow:

> "Bennett Calls for Hearing on Trade School Abuses," Vocational Training News, February 11, 1988, pp. 1; 7; 8.
>
> "Bennett Asks Congress to put Curb on 'Exploitative' For-Profit Schools," Education Week, February 17, 1988, pp. 1; 20.
>
> "For-Profit Trade Schools Defraud Students and Waste Federal Student-Aid Money, Bennett Charges in Scathing Report," The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 17, 1988, pp. 1; 21.

Again, while there is no evidence available to suggest that any proprietary school in this state deserve to be painted by the same brush that has been used by the former United States Secretary of Education, it behooves the proprietary schools in this state to support the recommendation of this paper in order to provide to the public evidence of the situation in North Carolina as it relates to proprietary schools. Accordingly, The Council RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, IN COLLABORATION WITH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, EMPLOY AN "INDEPENDENT, OUTSIDE CONSULTANT" TO CONDUCT A STUDY OF PROPRIETARY (FOR PROFIT) SCHOOLS IN THE STATE.

11. Proprietary Schools

Twenty-eight proprietary schools are licensed by the State Board of Education. Nine of these also are licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina to confer two-year associate degrees. The twenty-eight schools are shown in Table D.5. Excluded from this table are proprietary schools exempt from licensure. Among these exempt schools are nonprofit religious institutions, schools conducted by employers for their own employees where no fee or tuition is charged, and any school for which there is another legally existing board in the State. While no centralized list of these schools could be located, they train for such diverse and numberous occupational areas as cosmetology, barbering, nursing, paramedical technology, radiologic technology, cytotechnology, real estate, auctioneering, flight (for commercial pilot liscenses), and truck driving as well as Bible schools.

TABLE D.5. PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS LICENSED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (INCLUDING NINE LICENSED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA)

BUSINESS SCHOOLS

American Business & Fashion Institute
Charlotte

*Blanton's Junior College of Business
Asheville
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration
    Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
    Associate of Applied Science in Computer Programming

Brookstone College of Business
High Point

*Cecils Junior College of Business
Asheville
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration - Management/Marketing
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration - Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration - Secretarial Science
    Associate of Applied Science in Medical Office Administrative Assistant
    Associate of Applied Science in Legal Office Administrative Assistant
    Associate of Applied Science in Computer Science

Draughon Business College
Winston-Salem

Greenville School of Commerce
Greenville

---

* Degree-granting schools

TABLE D.5 (continued). PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS LICENSED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (INCLUDING NINE LISCENSED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA)

*Hardbarger Junior College of Business
Raleigh
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
- Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration
- Associate of Applied Science in Senior Accounting
- Associate of Applied Science in Executive Secretarial
- Associate of Applied Science in Medical Secretarial
- Associate of Applied Science in Legal Secretarial
- Associate of Applied Science in Word Processing Secretarial
- Associate of Applied Science in Fashion Merchandising
- Associate of Applied Science in Computer Science

King's Business College
Charlotte

Miller-Motte Business College
Wilmington

Miller-Motte Business College
Gastonia

*Rutledge College of Charlote, Inc.
Charlotte
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
- Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
- Associate of Applied Science in Management
- Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
- Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
- Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

*Rutledge College of Durham, Inc.
Durham
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
- Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
- Associate of Applied Science in Management
- Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
- Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
- Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

---

* Degree-granting schools

TABLE D.5 (continued). PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS LICENSED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (INCLUDING NINE LISCENSED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA)

*Rutledge College of Fayetteville, Inc.
Fayetteville
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Management
    Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial
    Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

*Rutledge College of Greensboro, Inc.
Greensboro
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Management
    Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
    Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

*Rutledge College of Raleigh, Inc.
Raleigh
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Management
    Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
    Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
    Associate of Applied Science in Business Administration

*Rutledge College of Winston-Salem, Inc.
Winston-Salem
Degree Programs Licensed by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina:
    Associate of Applied Science in Accounting
    Associate of Applied Science in Management
    Associate of Applied Science in Secretarial Science
    Associate of Applied Science in Merchandising
    Associate of Applied Science in Data Processing

Salisbury Business College, Inc.
Salisbury

---

* Degree-granting schools

TABLE D.5 (continued). PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS LICENSED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (INCLUDING NINE LISCENSED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA)

TRADE SCHOOLS

American Motor Institute
Charlotte

Bolston Private Electronics Institute
Winston-Salem

Carolina School of Broadcasting
Charlotte

Computer Academy
Charlotte

John Roberts Powers School of Fashion Careers
Raleigh

Lucas Travel School, Inc.
Charlotte

Lucas Travel School, Inc.
Greensboro

Lucas Travel School, Inc.
Raleigh

MTA School
Greensboro

PCA Video Production Institute
Matthews

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL

Peace Officer Training Service
Fayetteville

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Beginning in October 1987, Pelavin Associates undertook an exploratory study of consumer rights and accountability in postsecondary vocational-technical (PVT) programs for the U.S. Department of Education. The study focused on how effectively the governance structure -- accreditation and Federal and state regulation -- ensures that consumer rights are protected and that institutions are appropriately accountable to both consumers and taxpayers for the educational services being provided. The study also explored what types of problems, if any, exist in the area of PVT education.

The study relied primarily on a carefully designed set of interviews with Federal officials; state and guarantee agency staff in California, Illinois, and Texas; and institutional administrators at nine public and proprietary institutions recommended to us by accreditation agencies and states as having exemplary practices. The main strategy was to use states to identify problems and institutions to demonstrate exemplary practice. While other strategies and protocols were also used -- literature review, secondary data collection and analysis, legislative and regulatory review -- the bulk of the findings come directly from the interviews. These interviews permitted dozens of individuals to provide observations on the adequacy of the governance structure in protecting consumer rights and accountability. When individuals across three states cited instances in which abuses occurred, we concluded that the structure had failed in important ways.

Since this study was exploratory, its findings do not include estimates of the frequency, severity, or magnitude of the problems that were identified. Rather, the findings indicate that the structure of PVT education permits these problems to occur and thus consumers' rights are not being adequately protected. In particular, our study found serious structural problems in the governance, operation, and delivery of postsecondary vocational-technical education. Although we found that the institutions we visited exhibited some exemplary practices, overall the study found evidence of significant problems, including:

- Questionable recruiting and admissions practices appear common despite accreditation standards. Consumer information, while apparently accurate when provided, is often lacking.

- The new ability to benefit provisions do not appear to have reduced the number of students of questionable ability being admitted to vocational-technical programs.

- Problems appear to exist concerning the price charged by institutions, the potential for circumventing GSL need analysis, and variability in quality control across Guarantee Agencies. Regulatory violations are common, including awarding aid to ineligible students.

- Low program completion rates appear to be a problem at many vocational-technical institutions. Obtaining accurate and timely refunds from proprietary institutions appears to be a major problem in all states.

- Loan default is a major problem at both public and proprietary vocational-technical institutions, and a pattern of factors (including low or no real admissions standards, high dropout rates, programs of marginal quality, and low placement rates) at these institutions virtually guarantees high default rates.

- The current accreditation processes are flawed. Accreditation is being progressively weakened because an increasing number of institutions are opening branch campuses and thereby getting automatic accreditation; because competition among commissions for member institutions limits the incentives for accreditation commission to enforce standards; and because of the threat of anti-trust litigation by affected schools against accreditation commissions if they do enforce standards.

SECTION 8

We need balance in the community college system.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES (SBCC) ESTABLISH AS A STANDING POLICY ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NORTH CAROLINA THE NATIONAL MEDIAN EXPENDITURE PER CREDIT HOUR FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COLLEGES, AND THAT THE SBCC SEEK A RESOLUTION FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO THE END OF ACCEPTING THIS POLICY AS A GOAL FOR THE STATE.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

North Carolina operates for its adult citizens a nationally recognized system of community college institutions, currently 58 in number. (The system also serves as a fiscal appropriations agency for a 59th institution, the Vocational Textile School in Belmont, North Carolina.) The system is renowned for its comprehensive educational offerings, enrollment of over 600,000 students annually, commitment to serving minorities, having the third largest number of institutions among the 49 states having 2-year community institutions, linkages to business and industry, and a preponderance of enrollment (about 75%) in vocational and technical programs. Unfortunately, the system is recognized also for having faculty salaries (see Attachment I) and per student expenditures ranked among the lowest in the nation.

According to an article entitled "Community College Spending," in the March 1988 issue of the Business Officer, the median expenditure per credit full-time student equivalent (FTSE) in 1986-87 among vocational/technical colleges was $5,049. (The data were derived from 535 responding colleges nationwide.) By comparison, the State President of the North Carolina Community College System reported that $3321 was spent annually on each student in the community college institutions in this state (The News & Observer, Raleigh, NC, August 25, 1988, p. 21A).

The North Carolina Community College System clearly is underfunded. The short range impact can only be less than quality education for community college students and reduced earning power for the graduates over the years. The long-range impact can only be inadequately prepared manpower and impaired productivity and profitability for business and industry.

North Carolina has the fiscal capacity to provide substantially improved financial support for the system of community colleges. For example, the average pay of full-time faculty in North Carolina public four-year institutions of higher education ranks twentieth among the fifty states (Attachment II). The per capita personal income in North Carolina ranks thirty-four among the fifty states (Attachment III).

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," believes that it is imperative that the per student expenditure be substantially increased to provide high quality instruction, up-to-date machines and equipment for students to use in learning, and adequate supplies, books and equipment for the shops, laboratories, libraries, and classrooms. A reasonable goal is to move North Carolina to the national median of per FTSE expenditure in vocational/technical colleges. The Council is aware that the State President and the SBCC have adopted a biennial budget to move the North Carolina Community College System closer to the national median per FTSE expenditure of $4439 in community colleges. The Council applauds that effort, but also believes that goal is inadequate. Inasmuch as North Carolina community colleges are first and foremost occupational education institutions, the Council urges that the funding goal should be at the least to attain the national median for comparable vocational/technical institutions.

The Council has been concerned about the issue of appropriate funding for the community colleges for sometime. For example, in a 1984 report, adopted by the Council, entitled: The Public Funding of Education in North Carolina, it was revealed that in terms of state funding, between fiscal year 1972-73 to 1982-83, the statistical average state appropriation per student in the community college system decreased about twenty-five per cent (25%) after adjustments for inflation (p. 40).

Moreover, the Council has in two previous recommendations attempted to provide clarity in how students are counted for budget making by recommending that:

> THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE FOR COUNTING STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SO AS TO PROVIDE, AT MINIMAL COST, TIMELY DATA FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING (August, 1988).

Following this recommendation, the Council has recommended how the value of the various programs of instruction should be assessed for budget making by recommending that:

> THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE FOR WEIGHTING FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENTS FOR PURPOSES OF MAKING BUDGET REQUESTS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOR AND FUND ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES (November, 1988).

Based on these prior recommendations, The Council now RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES (SBCC) ESTABLISH A STANDING POLICY OF ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NORTH CAROLINA THE NATIONAL MEDIAN EXPENDITURE PER CREDIT HOUR FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COLLEGES, AND THAT THE SBCC SEEK A RESOLUTION FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO THE END OF ACCEPTING THIS POLICY AS A GOAL FOR THE STATE.

Attachment I

NORTH CAROLINA STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1985-86 AVERAGE PAY OF FULL-TIME FACULTY IN PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS*

Alabama	$27,500	Montana	$26,200
Alaska	45,100	Nebraska	22,200
Arizona	31,800	Nevada	27,400
Arkansas	22,500	New Hampshire	22,200
California	36,100	New Jersey	30,600
Colorado	24,300	New Mexico	26,900
Connecticut	30,000	New York	33,600
Delaware	26,500	North Carolina	20,300 (Ranks 48 of 49)
Florida	24,800	North Dakota	26,100
Georgia	26,300	Ohio	26,900
Hawaii	28,000	Oklahoma	26,400
Idaho	25,000	Oregon	27,700
Illinois	30,900	Pennsylvania	27,900
Indiana	20,400	Rhode Island	27,000
Iowa	22,400	South Carolina	21,600
Kansas	25,500	South Dakota	None
Kentucky	22,200	Tennessee	24,100
Louisiana	24,400	Texas	28,900
Maine	22,300	Utah	25,600
Maryland	30,600	Vermont	25,500
Massachusetts	29,800	Virginia	25,700
Michigan	32,700	Washington	27,500
Minnesota	30,400	West Virginia	21,800
Mississippi	19,200 (Ranks 49 of 49)	Wisconsin	29,300
Missouri	27,800	Wyoming	27,600

USA $29,600

---

*Nine-month contracts for 1985-86 year. Information from U.S. Department of Education as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, September 1, 1988, pp. 1-90.

Attachment II

NORTH CAROLINA STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1985-86 AVERAGE PAY OF FULL-TIME FACULTY IN PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS*

Alabama	$30,900	Montana	$28,600
Alaska	42,600	Nebraska	29,400
Arizona	35,900	Nevada	33,800
Arkansas	29,100	New Hampshire	30,900
California	42,000	New Jersey	36,900
Colorado	32,900	New Mexico	30,300
Connecticut	38,600	New York	38,800
Delaware	33,800	North Carolina	33,100 (ranks 20 of 50)
Florida	33,100	North Dakota	28,900
Georgia	32,300	Ohio	35,700
Hawaii	32,400	Oklahoma	31,100
Idaho	29,200	Oregon	29,900
Illinois	33,500	Pennsylvania	32,900
Indiana	31,900	Rhode Island	32,800
Iowa	31,500	South Carolina	31,300
Kansas	31,300	South Dakota	26,800
Kentucky	29,500	Tennessee	31,500
Louisiana	28,000	Texas	32,400
Maine	28,400	Utah	33,500
Maryland	33,900	Vermont	31,400
Massachusetts	37,700	Virginia	33,700
Michigan	34,800	Washington	33,800
Minnesota	35,900	West Virginia	27,700
Mississippi	27,800	Wisconsin	33,200
Missouri	29,900	Wyoming	36,200

USA $34,000

---

*Nine-month contracts for 1985-86 year. Information from U.S. Department of Education as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, September 1, 1988, pp. 1-90.

Attachment III

NORTH CAROLINA STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
1987 PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME*

Alabama	$11,940	Montana	$12,347
Alaska	18,230	Nebraska	14,328
Arizona	14,315	Nevada	16,366
Arkansas	11,507	New Hampshire	17,529
California	17,821	New Jersey	20,352
Colorado	15,584	New Mexico	11,875
Connecticut	21,266	New York	18,004
Delaware	16,696	North Carolina	13,314 (Rank: 34 of 50)
Florida	15,584	North Dakota	13,004
Georgia	14,300	Ohio	14,612
Hawaii	15,679	Oklahoma	12,551
Idaho	11,868	Oregon	14,041
Illinois	16,442	Pennsylvania	15,212
Indiana	13,914	Rhode Island	15,555
Iowa	14,236	South Carolina	12,004
Kansas	15,126	South Dakota	12,550
Kentucky	12,059	Tennessee	12,880
Louisiana	11,473	Texas	13,866
Maine	13,954	Utah	11,366
Maryland	18,124	Vermont	14,302
Massachusetts	19,142	Virginia	16,517
Michigan	15,393	Washington	15,599
Minnesota	15,927	West Virginia	11,020
Mississippi	10,292	Wisconsin	14,742
Missouri	14,687	Wyoming	12,709

USA $15,481

---

*U.S. Department of Commerce as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, September 1, 1988, pp. 1-90.

SECTION 9

Is weighting worth the trouble?

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE (described herein) FOR WEIGHTING FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENTS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAKING BUDGET REQUESTS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOR AND FUND ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

From the early days of the North Carolina community college system that was created by the General Assembly in 1963, full-time student equivalents (FTSE) (currently known as FTE or full-time equivalency) have been weighted to direct funds to the various program categories of extension or continuing education, vocational, technical, general, and college transfer education. The purposes of weighting FTSE (full-time student equivalents) for funding requests and allocations by broad program categories were to encourage each local community college institution to offer comprehensive course offerings and to generate funds for the desired local program emphasis, as well as to accommodate cost differentials among the various program areas. Special funding for high cost programs has been limited over the twenty-five year life of the community college system. Some exceptions were "start-up" or improvement funds for identified high priority programs and funding for marine technology, heavy equipment operation, and the saw milling program.

The weighting of the FTSE by broad program areas was first accomplished by counting contact hours of student attendance and currently by counting contact hours of student membership. To illustrate the current method, one vocational or technical student enrolled for thirty clock hours per week equates nearly two FTSE as compared to a college transfer student who, for example, may be enrolled for sixteen clock hours per week, which equates to one FTSE. It was possible to count one student for two or more FTSE because it had earlier been determined by policy action of the State Board that being enrolled in a class 16 hours per week for an eleven-week period by any student or a combination of students constituted one FTSE. This clock-hour counting procedure of weighting accomplished the goal of generating funds for high cost programs like technical and vocational programs to a higher level of support than for other programs.

The weighting by clock hours of enrollees worked satisfactorily when enrollments were small in the 1960s and early 1970s. The counting system became inefficient and costly to administer and manage as the enrollments mounted in later years to the 300,000 and more recently to the 600,000 student levels. Furthermore, as state funding tightened over the years, the weighting system became distorted by institutions increasing required clock hours of instruction for students to increase the FTSE-based funding (this distortion has been described variously as "padding" or the "FTSE chase"). Furthermore, the budget makers, legislators, and others became confused by a contact hour weighting methodology which creates as many as two or more FTSEs for any student actually enrolled.

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called The Council, addressed the student counting credibility problem in a recommendation adopted August 26, 1988 that "The State Board of Community Colleges Adopt a New Procedure for Counting Students Enrolled in Community Colleges so as to Provide, at Minimal Cost, Timely Data for Planning and Budgeting." Now it is time to address the matter associated by this recommendation.

An attachment to the aforementioned recommendation noted a simplified weighting procedure which could be used as a model for directing funds to broad program areas according to the policies and priorities of the State Board of Community Colleges. That attachment (II) from the previous recommendation is also attached to this recommendation. An example from the attachment is reproduced below:

Program	FTSE	Weight		Fund Base		Allocation
College Transfer	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
General Education	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Technical	1	1.5	X	$4,000	=	$6,000
Vocational	1	1.8	X	$4,000	=	$7,200
Occupational Extension	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Other Extension	1	.8	X	$4,000	=	$3,200

The weights used in the above model approximate those achieved by contact hour counting in the early days of the community college system before the "FTSE chase" distortions occurred. The fund base used for illustration is less than the national median of $5,049 per FTSE as reported in Community, Technical and Junior Colleges Journal, June-July, 1988. Should the State Board of Community Colleges choose, individual curriculums with unusually high costs (for example, heavy equipment, marine technology, saw milling, and those in the health curriculums) could be assigned higher weightings than those in the broad program areas.

The Council believes that adoption of the simple weighting method described above will accomplish the following for the community college system:

(1) End the confusion resulting from the present student clock hour weighting system which inflates the FTSE numbers by counting one student as two FTSE in many cases.

(2) Establish a credible weighted funding method.

(3) Provide an understandable system for policymakers to exercise program funding priorities.

(4) Provide administrators with a simple method for budget projection and fund allocation among program areas.

It is for these reasons, as well as others, that the Council RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ADOPT A NEW PROCEDURE (described herein) FOR WEIGHTING FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENTS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAKING BUDGET REQUESTS FOR AND FUND ALLOCATIONS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

Attachment II

SAMPLE PROCEDURE FOR COUNTING FULL-TIME STUDENT EQUIVALENT (FTSE)

1. FTSE for each quarter in the academic year will be totaled and divided by 3 (fall, winter, spring quarters) to determine Average Annual FTSE. Summer quarter FTSE will be added (at 1/3 rate) to the average annual FTSE to encourage year-round use of facilities and other resources.
2. FTSE will be audited against the dollars collected (or charged and waived).
3. A standard refund period will be established by the State Board of Community Colleges. The quarter census of student headcount and FTSE will be made after the refund period has ended. The count will be taken from a monthly business office report.
4. Students beginning classes following the initial standard refund period will be counted in the same manner as above but in the following quarter.
5. One student shall not contribute more than one (1) FTSE student to the total number of FTSE students. See illustration below.

CURRICULUM (CREDIT HOURS)

Registered Credit Hours	Tuition Paid or Waived		FTSE
1-4	$ 6.25 - $25.00	=	1/3
5-9	$31.25 - $56.25	=	2/3
10-14 plus	$62.50 - $75.00	=	1

EXTENSION/CONTINUING EDUCATION (CLOCK HOURS)
OCCUPATIONAL

Registered Clock Hours	Fee Paid or Waived	FTSE
0-9	$ .00	0
10- 59	$ 5.00	1/3
60-119	$10.00	2/3
120-176 plus	$15.00	1

OTHER EXTENSION (OR CONTINUING EDUCATION)

10- 59	$ 7.00	1/3
60-119	$14.00	2/3
120-176	$20.00	1

EXAMPLE OF REGISTRATION FLOW OF STUDENT

Step 1, Adviser to Plan Program, and Step 2, Business Office (by machine) will:

1. Calculate fee
2. Enter Waiver code, if any
3. Accept payment from student unless waived
4. Write receipt
5. Submit FTE report

FTSE REPORT

Receipt Number	Student Number	Student Name	Program Code	Credit Hours	Dollar Charge	FTSE Waiver Code	Amount Paid
1.							
2.							
.							
etc.							

This sample procedure as described above is solely concerned with a standard method of counting students enrolled in the Community College system. However, by weighting the FTSE according to programs, funds can be directed to high cost programs. See the following example.

Program	FTSE	Weight		Fund Base		Allocation
College Transfer	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
General Education	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Technical	1	1.5	X	$4,000	=	$6,000
Vocational	1	1.8	X	$4,000	=	$7,200
Occupational Extension	1	1.0	X	$4,000	=	$4,000
Other Extension	1	.8	X	$4,000	=	$3,200

SECTION 10

How effective are vocational student organizations?

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION CONDUCT A STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

Perhaps the best known scholarship program in North Carolina is the "Morehead Scholars." The John Motley Morehead Foundation was established in 1945 in the words of its founder to provide "... education and training ... [for our future] leaders ... who have been endowed by their Creator with the capacity for leadership ..." (The John Motley Morehead Foundation 1988 Annual Report, p. 3). How successful has the Morehead Foundation been in achieving its founder goal? When the Morehead Foundation's office was asked recently for a study of the scholarship's impact on the recipients, the Executive Director in a letter of September 20, 1988 stated that: "A Study of the Foundation's impact on recipients is not available ...."

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," believes that an assessment of any program is desirable from time to time. It is with this spirit that The Council recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) conduct a statewide assessment of the Vocational Student Organizations (VSOs).

VSOs have been an essential part of vocational education programs since 1917 when the federal government became legally involved in vocational education. Moreover, The Council has been interested in VSOs and from time to time recommendations have been made to the SBE about them. For example in 1971, The Council recommended to the SBE "that occupational education youth organization activities continue to be recognized and strongly encouraged and supported as integral parts of occupational education curricula." While it is not known to The Council what action the SBE took in response to that recommendation, what is known is that in 1974, The Council made another recommendation to the SBE about VSOs:

> That occupational education youth organizations continue to be coordinated and strengthened through state-level leadership and that the State Board, in its move to eliminate fees, look seriously at state support for youth organization fees, especially for disadvantaged students.

The SBE did respond, in part, to the above recommendation in its 1976 State Plan for Vocational Education. The response pointed out that a proposed policy statement on youth organization was considered by the SBE. In fact this policy statement was ultimately adopted by the SBE in February 1972 and distributed to all superintendents, principals, local directors of occupational education and occupational education teachers.

Now it is time to conduct a statewide assessment of the VSOs. During 1986-87 the name, number of chapters and members were as follows:

Name of the VSO	Number of Chapters	Members
Future Farmers of America	246	16,024
Future Homemakers of America--Home Economics Related Organizations	337	11,813
Future Business Leaders of America	269	12,754
Vocational Industrial Clubs of America	440	11,000
Distributive Education Clubs of America	220	10,488
Career Exploration Clubs of North Carolina	312	9,600
Health Occupations Students of America	132	4,634
American Industrial Arts Student Association	41	1,100
	1,997	77,413

Such an assessment should determine the impact of the respective VSO on its members. Such an assessment might well be used to strengthen the VSO, as appropriate, so as to better serve its members.

Accordingly, THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION CONDUCT A STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF THE VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS.

SECTION 11

Everyone benefits from mutual support.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE LOCAL DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INVITE THE NORTH CAROLINA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPERS ASSOCIATION (NCIDA) TO A MEETING TO EXPLAIN THE ROLE OF SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO ENCOURAGE THE STATE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO SUPPORT THIS TYPE OF MEETING WITH NCIDA AS WELL AS OTHER ASSOCIATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS OF LIKE KIND.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

One of the responsibilities of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," is to advise the business community, among others, on initiatives and methods the private sector could undertake to assist in the modernization of vocational education programs as well as to submit recommendations to the State Board of Education (SBE) on the conduct of vocational education programs conducted in the state which emphasize the use of business concerns and labor organizations. A response to these mandates is the primary goal of the recommendation of this paper.

It has been said that "secondary vocational education is the best kept secret in North Carolina." Whether this statement is true or not, it is apparent to The Council that the role of secondary vocational education is not as well understood by the business/industry community as seems desirable, especially the role secondary vocational education might play in a community's economic development strategy. Few, if any, local directors of vocational education are actively involved with the economic development team as new clients are considering locating a firm in a community. It is, thereby, important for the economic developers to become aware of the role of secondary vocational education.

The Council believes that there are a number of approaches which could be taken to heighten the awareness of economic developers to the role of secondary vocational education in economic development. The Council believes, however, that the simplest, quickest, and best way would be for the local directors of vocational education to invite NCIDA to a joint meeting so the role of secondary vocational education could be better explained. Hence, the recommendation of this paper.

While NCIDA is an important association in this effort of explaining better the role of secondary vocational education in economic development, there are a number of other associations/organizations that could also benefit from such a joint effort. Many such organizations/associations are represented by trade associations located in the city of Raleigh.

Accordingly, The Council RECOMMENDS THAT THE LOCAL DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION INVITE THE NORTH CAROLINA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPERS ASSOCIATION (NCIDA) TO A MEETING TO EXPLAIN THE ROLE OF SECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO ENCOURAGE THE STATE DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO SUPPORT THIS TYPE OF MEETING WITH NCIDA AS WELL AS OTHER ASSOCIATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS OF LIKE KIND.

SECTION 12

Did you know that the military is one of our largest and strongest economic sectors?

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION REQUEST A BRIEFING ON THE ROLE THE MILITARY HAS PLAYED AND CONTINUES TO PLAY IN IMPROVING THE ELECTRONICS CURRICULUM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND THE ROLE THE MILITARY IS PROJECTED TO PLAY IN ENHANCING MATH AND SCIENCE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

On September 28, 1988, a "Technology Transfer in Action" teleconference was conducted (see the attachment for reference). One of the conference sites was the School of Technology in Lincoln County. Parenthetically, the Lincoln School of Technology is unique in North Carolina in at least two ways. (1) It is the only school with this name, and (2) it serves also as the extension office of Gaston Community College in Lincoln County.

A review of the attached agenda for the teleconference will reveal a number of important events, not the least of which is the "Projected 1989 Schedule of Workshops in Math, Science, and Electronics for High School Students and Educators/Trainers," as well as a "National Outreach in Technology (NOTE) Conference" scheduled for April 25-27, 1989 in Augusta, Georgia. In addition, the attachment will reveal the agenda for the teleconference for September 28, 1988. During the "Question and Answer Session," it was revealed, when a question was asked about why the military became involved in working with the public schools to update the electronics curriculum, that Robert A. Mullen, Deputy Director of the Division of Vocational Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, was the person who made the request for the military to get involved. As a byproduct of his request, the electronics curriculum, as well as a number of electronics teachers, have benefited from the involvement of the military. Because of this involvement by the military as well as the projected expansion into additional curricula areas, THE STATE

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION REQUEST A BRIEFING ON THE ROLE THE MILITARY HAS PLAYED AND CONTINUES TO PLAY IN IMPROVING THE ELECTRONICS CURRICULUM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND THE ROLE THE MILITARY IS PROJECTED TO PLAY IN ENHANCING MATH AND SCIENCE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.

Attachment

TELTRAIN II

Technology Transfer in Action

28 September 1988

NSCCE

NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS

Fort Gordon, Georgia
(404) 791-7621/7284

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS

The National Science Center for Communications and Electronics (NSCCE) is committed to increasing the technological literacy of American youth and the general public by helping to improve nationwide the quality of science and mathematics education and communications and electronics training. The NSCCE is a joint effort on the part of a private foundation (NSC Foundation) and the U.S. Army (NSCCE Task Force) to establish a national resource center where state-of-the-art educational technologies can be demonstrated, researched, developed, evaluated, distributed, and promoted. One aspect of this effort is facilitating the transfer of technology from NSCCE to other organizations.

Technology transfer can be defined as a process by which existing research knowledge is transferred operationally into useful purposes that fulfill actual or potential needs (Federal Council for Science and Technology, 1975). The technology transfer process is also known as innovation acceptance, knowledge dissemination and utilization, technology sharing, and diffusion of innovation. The process is basically one of change. The transfer is from the producer to the user. The producer is an individual or an organization involved in the research, development, and marketing of a product. The user of the technology is an individual or an organization who (a) is to be made aware of the technology or innovation and/or (b) has an expressed or potential need for such technology. The change occurs when the user of the technology adopts and successfully utilizes the new technology or innovation.

The NSCCE will become an important link for the educational and training community in not only providing information on instructional technology, but also acting as an agent in the actual transfer of such technology to the ultimate users - federal, state, and local educational and training organizations. This second of a series of teletraining sessions is designed to discuss and facilitate technology transfer between participating groups by offering information on projects in operation or being planned for the near future. We invite you to join us for TELTRAIN II: Technology Transfer in Action.

EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS FOR TELTRAIN II: TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IN ACTION

Moderator:
Dr. Robert Evans
Director, Special Projects/Principal Training Analyst
Eagle Technology, Inc.

Panelists:
Dr. Fred Davison
Vice Chair and CEO,
National Science Center Foundation

Dr. Roger Moore
Associate Director
Southern Technology Application Center

Dr. Frank Withrow
Team Leader, Technology Applications Group
Programs for Improvement of Practice
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Department of Education

Karen Ott-Worrow
Staff Editor/Reporter
Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
Editor of Training for New Technology

Darcia D. Bracken, Ph.D.
Program Specialist
Office of Applied Technology
Center for Utilization of Federal Technology
National Technical Information Service

Bernard J. Cameron
Director
Governmental, Business, and Industrial Relations
Fairfax County (VA) Public School System

TELTRAIN II
28 SEPTEMBER 1988
AGENDA

(EDT)	
0800	Downlink Test
0900	Introduction to the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics (NSCCE)
0906	Introduction to TELTRAIN II Dr. Fred Davison
0909	Welcome Major General Leo M. Childs (USA)
0912	How TELTRAIN II Will Work
0915	Introduction to Panel
0918	"Technology Transfer in Action" Panel Interviews and Discussion Session
1015	Break
1030	Question and Answer Session
1115	Break
1130	"Meeting on the Air" with Colonel Rimbey
1230	Satellite off air

PROJECTED 1989 SCHEDULE

WORKSHOPS IN MATH, SCIENCE, AND ELECTRONICS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS/TRAINERS

12-16 June 1989

19-23 June 1989

26-30 June 1989

10-14 July 1989

17-21 July 1989

24-28 July 1989

31 July - 4 Aug 1989

7-11 Aug 1989

WORKSHOP ELECTIVES

Computer Literacy

Avionics

Field Radio Repair

Microwave Repair

Satellite Communications

Desktop Publishing

Special Electronics Equipment

Common Precision Soldering

TV Production

Introduction To Computer Programming

Math And Science Topics
(Specific Sessions To Be Determined)

NATIONAL OUTREACH IN TECHNOLOGY AND EDUCATION (NOTE) CONFERENCE

25-27 April 1989

Augusta, GA

THE PROGRAM

The theme for the 1989 NOTE Conference focuses on the current use of technology to solve problems in training and educational programs. With a diminishing or nonexistent pool of teaching resources from which to draw, the need for using educational technology becomes paramount. Educational technology cannot make a "good" teacher or trainer; however, when used properly, educational technology provides an excellent tool for educators to strengthen their information delivery and manage their classrooms. This conference intends to address applications of these training/educational technologies and demonstrate how they can best benefit the end user.

THE PLACE

This third annual NSCCE Conference will be held April 25-27, 1989, at the Augusta-Richmond County Civic Center, 601 Seventh Street, Augusta, Georgia 30905.

Sponsored by

The National Science Center
for Communications and
Electronics

with the support of the

American Defense Preparedness
Association

SECTION 13

The emerging High Tech Age requires "evolving" textbooks.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE) PROPOSE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT LEAST THE CHANGES UNDER STRATEGY #1 (below) IN THE STATE LAWS REGARDING "TEXTBOOKS" AND THAT THE SBE REQUEST ITS STUDY COMMITTEE FOR TEXTBOOK ADOPTION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES TO CONSIDER THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED UNDER STRATEGY #2 (below).

Adopted on November 18, 1988

In making this recommendation to the SBE, the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," wishes to hasten to say that it is aware that the SBE recently appointed a "Study Committee for Textbook Adoption Process and Procedures," hereinafter called the "Study Committee." As a matter of record, The Council takes special notice of the Minutes of the SBE of September 7, 1988 (p. 2) in which an expenditure of $30,000 was approved to support the work of the Study Committee. The Council wishes to applaud the SBE for establishing the Study Committee, and insofar as it can ascertain, the Study Committee is busy with its assigned task of reviewing the adoption process and procedures of textbooks. The Council believes, however, that this charge by the SBE to the Study Committee is too narrow an assignment in view of the role textbooks play in the education of the students in North Carolina. More on that later.

For now, The Council wishes again to compliment the SBE for establishing the Study Committee. The Council's compliment is based primarily upon its own work entitled the "Historical Development of the North Carolina Textbook Commission and its Current Status" (a report adopted by The Council in August, 1988). Apparently, the Study Committee found the paper of benefit as is evidenced in the attachment.

As suggested earlier in this paper, The Council believes that the task assigned to the Study Committee, while very important, is too narrow a review of the role and function of textbooks in the education of students in this state.

Therefore, The Council proposes a two-fold strategy, one immediate and one long-term, related to textbooks.

Strategy #1 (Immediate):

That the SBE request at least the following changes be made in the General Statutes regarding "Textbooks":

- Amend 115C-87 to the end that retired educators, teachers educators in the public and private institutions of higher education may serve as members on the Textbook Commission.
- Add a provision at the end of 115C-87 requiring training for any Textbook Commission Member before he/she may begin the task of evaluating any textbook.
- Add a new section in the General Statutes requiring the use of "subject area teachers" in the preliminary evaluation of any textbook, with the final evaluation being conducted by the Textbook Commission subject to review and approval by the SBE. (This section should eliminate the use of "advisors or peers" as is now the current practice, which is apparently being done without benefit of legal authority.)

The effect of this recommendation is to create "subject area" subcommittees to screen textbooks under consideration each year by the Textbook Commission. For example, if a Marketing Textbook is under consideration, marketing teachers would be involved in evaluating the text for recommendation to the Textbook Commission. The Council also proposes that appropriate training be mandated before any "subject area" subcommittee member could begin to screen any text. The effect of this recommendation is to reduce the burden of screening every text by the Textbook Commission.

Strategy 2 (Long-term):

Questions the SBE may want the Study Committee to consider:

- Should the Textbook Commission be assigned administratively to the "Media and Technology Services Division" in the Department of Public Education?
- Should the new schools scheduled to be built in the state in the future be constructed with an eye to making them "Electronic Schools" (see the September, 1988 issue of The American School Board Journal)? If so, the textbook might become a basic reference book with the book being "electronically" updated as needed (see "Power On! New Tools for Teaching and Learning," issued by the Office of Technology Assessment, Congress of the United States, September, 1988).
- Should the textbook of the future be the basic reference book for each subject (mentioned above) along with a personal computer for each student? Each student's computer could be plugged into the "electronic school" as well as taken home for homework! (See "BellSouth to Offer Information Service to Phone Customers," The Wall Street Journal, September 1, 1988). The personal computer, tied into appropriate data bases, either at school and/or at home, could well be an extension of the basic text in the near future (see also "What the Ostrich Sees: Technology and the Mission of American Education," Kappan, September, 1988, pp. 18-19).
- Should the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina (BG-UNC) be invited to consider joint purchasing of textbooks for its students? One of the largest costs of attending the state's community colleges and public universities currently is the cost of textbooks. An article in The Appalachian (September 22, 1988, p. 1), published by Appalachian State University, entitled "Bookstore's markup results in greater student expense" may express

87

this concern best. Could the SBCC and the BG-UNC purchase students' textbooks at less cost through a unified purchasing system that is in place through the SBE? Perhaps this should be explored as a potential response to House Bill 245 in that the three statewide education boards are directed "... to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this state (underlining for emphasis).

In view of the questions posed heretofore as well as for other reasons, THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE) PROPOSE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT LEAST THE CHANGES UNDER STRATEGY #1 (above) IN THE STATE LAWS REGARDING "TEXTBOOKS" AND THAT THE SBE REQUEST ITS STUDY COMMITTEE FOR TEXTBOOK ADOPTION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES TO CONSIDER THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED UNDER STRATEGY #2 (above).

Attachment

HOWARD H. HAWORTH
CHAIRMAN
MORGANTON

BARBARA M. TAPSCOTT
VICE-CHAIRMAN
BURLINGTON

CRAIG PHILLIPS
SECRETARY
STATE SUPT. PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
RALEIGH

ROBERT B. JORDAN, III
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
RALEIGH

HARLAN E. BOYLES
STATE TREASURER
RALEIGH

JAMES B. CHAVIS
FAYETTEVILLE

NORTH CAROLINA
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Education Building
116 West Edenton Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1712

KENNETH R. HARRIS
CHARLOTTE

WILLIAM C. MEEKINS, JR.
ELIZABETH CITY

MARY B. MORGAN
JACKSONVILLE

PATRICIA H. NEAL
DURHAM

CARY C. OWEN
ASHEVILLE

DONALD D. POLLOCK
KINSTON

PREZELL R. ROBINSON
RALEIGH

NORMA B. TURNAGE
ROCKY MOUNT

August 15, 1988

Dr. E. Michael Latta
Executive Director
North Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education
530 N. Wilmington Street (Watson House)
Raleigh, North Carolina 27604

Dear Mike:

On behalf of the members of the State Task Force to Study Textbook Adoption Procedures, we would like to express our appreciation for your permitting us to use the "Draft" of *Historical Development of the North Carolina Textbook Commission and Its Current Status* at our first meeting this week. It was very helpful in acquainting members with the history of the Textbook Commission and giving us some preliminary insights into the development of the State Statutes.

Again, thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tapscott

Barbara Tapscott

BT:em

CC: Mr. Howard Haworth
Mr. Michael Priddy

SECTION 14

Let's reconsider "a unified system of education that better serves students."

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE GOVERNOR REQUEST THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO ENACT LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ASSIGN THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO HOLD FULL-TIME, STATE-PAID POSITIONS.

Adopted February 19, 1988
Readopted November 18, 1988

> The foregoing recommendation was first adopted on February 19, 1988. At a meeting of The Council in May, 1988, it was determined that further study of this recommendation was needed. Accordingly, further study was undertaken with a review of the evidence at The Council's August, 1988 meeting. After additional review, The Council reissued this recommendation on November 18, 1988, with modifications in the content of the paper.

Nearly 2 million students will be served by the public education system during school year 1988-89. These students will be served by the state's public schools, the community college institutions, and the constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina. Are these students served effectively and efficiently? There is some evidence to suggest that they are not! One reason may be that North Carolina currently has a disjointed "system of education." The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," is recommending a unified "system of education" to better serve students.

Currently, there are three (3) major public state education boards that set educational policies, consistent with the actions taken by the General Assembly. These statewide education boards are: (1) the State Board of Education (SBE), (2) the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC), and (3) the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (BG-UNC). The SBE is also the State Board of Vocational Education "... at all levels ..." according to a state law that complies with the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (Public Law 98-524, as amended).

The SBE is the only constitutional education board in this state. Specific reference is made to its "powers and duties" as well as its membership in the State Constitution. (See Article IX of the *North Carolina Constitution*, which is Attachment I. Note especially sections 4 and 5.) While the *State Constitution* does refer to "higher education," neither the SBCC nor the BG-UNC is required by the Constitution. Both the SBCC and the BG-UNC are legislative creations. The key statement in the current *State Constitution* regarding higher education is Section 8. It states:

> The General Assembly shall maintain a public system of higher education, comprising The University of North Carolina and such other institutions of higher education as the General Assembly may deem wise.

The General Assembly has established from time to time agencies to manage the public institutions of higher education in this state. The most recent legislative creation was the SBCC; it became legally functional on January 1, 1981. Prior to that date, the functions of the SBCC were assigned to the SBE by the General Assembly. The SBE first began to oversee the development of the community college system in 1957 as a part of its vocational education operations. Even as this function was being performed by the SBE, that board's other primary responsibilities were to provide policy direction for the educational programs and the state's funds for the public schools.

The SBE has had the responsibility for program supervision of the public schools since 1868, when the second of the three state constitutions provided for the establishment of the SBE. (The two other state constitutions were adopted in 1776 and in 1971.) There have been periods of time that the SBE did not have direct responsibility for the fiscal affairs of the public schools.

From 1927 until 1933 and from 1933 until 1943, the State Board of Equalization and the State School Commission, respectively, both legislative creations, provided fiscal control over state funds for public schools. As to higher education, the State Constitution of 1868 required that:

> The University of North Carolina with its lands, emoluments and franchises, is under the control of the State, and shall be held to an inseparable connection with the Free Public School System of the State (underlining for emphasis).

The essence of the recommendation of this paper is that the General Assembly should return the state to a governance structure of yesteryear and recreate a unified system of education similar to the one that existed under the provision of the 1868 Constitution. To put the recommendation of The Council in perspective, an old adage seems to be appropriate: "In order to go forward, we have to go backward." Or to quote the Turkish proverb used by the President of The University System in a speech in Charlotte on September 9, 1987: "No matter how far you have gone on a wrong road, turn back." This admonition causes The Council to recommend that the Governor request the General Assembly to enact legislation to assign the functions of the SBCC and the BG-UNC to the SBE and for the members of the SBE to hold full-time, state paid positions.

There is much support for this recommendation. Among several recent reports, studies, and statements by a number of organizations and individuals, the citations in Appendix II seem unrelated until they are considered in the context of the state's disjointed education system. All of the citations in Attachment II suggest to The Council that what is needed in North Carolina is a unified system of education. One board, working in a united fashion, would likely do a better job in serving all students. While each of the statements in Attachment II are compelling in themselves to make the change as recommended in this paper, the most compelling reason to create a unified system of education may be found in an April 1987 report entitled *Continuing the Conversation*, prepared by the Third Century Project, that was financed by the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc. This report called for a mechanism to assure dialogue among all of the partners in higher education in the state (p.28). The recommendation of this paper called for a structure to formulate a mechanism to assure dialogue between and among *all* of the components of public education in the state, including higher education.

Indeed, how would the recommended structure accomplish the overall goal of this paper to better serve students? Recent events serve to illustrate how the proposed new structure could better serve students. Three examples are offered: (1) the SBE and the SBCC held a joint meeting on January 8, 1987 to discuss cooperative programming and dual enrollment of high school students in community college institutions. A committee from these boards was formed to explore these matters. The committee formulated a paper which both the SBE and SBCC adopted after taking over a year to develop the paper. However, to date, little results from the paper are evident. (2) During the 1986 session of the General Assembly, the BG-UNC was directed to conduct a study of the preparation of teachers. A report from the study entitled *The Education of North Carolina's Teachers* was delivered to the General Assembly. This report caused the BG-UNC to adopt a policy regarding the requirement of a "second academic major" for all teachers enrolled in teacher preparation programs in The University. The SBE has not, however, endorsed the "second academic major," probably because this new requirement for prospective teachers, beginning the Fall of 1988, is likely to cause a student to have to attend The University for five or more years in order to complete a four-year program. This policy action by the BG-UNC also is likely to cause additional shortages of teachers, especially vocational education teachers. It is unlikely that the General Assembly would be respective to a policy that is likely to cause a greater shortage of teachers, even though the 1987 General Assembly did direct in Section 96 of House Bill 1515 (Chapter 830) that the SBE and the BG-UNC "shall ... jointly develop a plan for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness and impact of the efforts to implement the objectives of the Report ...." If the state's educational institutions were under one board, these joint meetings and joint efforts would not be needed. A single State board would be in charge of the entire matter of teacher education. (3) The President of The University of North Carolina in a speech in Charlotte on September 9, 1987 proposed that the SBE "... make the requirements for graduation from high school in this state the same as the minimum requirements for admission to The University." Even though this proposal by the President was made in 1987, the BG-UNC as long ago as February 1984 established its own standards for admission to The University without consultation with the SBE. The BG-UNC later modified its earlier stated admission requirements, reportedly for two more years. This kind of "on again off again" policy by the BG-UNC would not be necessary if all educational policies for students were set by one State board.

What is needed in this state, from The Council's view, is a unified system of education that better serves students. The current disjointed "system of education" does not provide an easy mechanism for collaboration; the proposed new governance structure could provide this avenue.

In making this recommendation to the Governor to seek legislation to bring the functions of the SBCC and the BG-UNC under the SBE, The Council is aware that House Bill 245 (Chapter 1102), "An Act to Require the State Board of Education, the State Board of Community Colleges, and The University Board of Governors to Meet Jointly at Least Once a Year," was enacted by the General Assembly in 1988. Therefore, the recommendation of this paper builds on a previous action of the

General Assembly. In fact, House Bill 245 (Chapter 1102), requires the SBE, SBCC, and BG-UNC to meet *at least* once a year to "...discuss educational matters of mutual interest and to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this state." The Council is aware also of the enactment of House Bill 331 that places the fiscal affairs of the SBE under the jurisdiction of the elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Key provisions in this law requires, however, that "The State Board of Education shall establish policy for the system..." and that "The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall administer the policies ...." Both enactments, House Bill 245 and House Bill 331, give further support that membership on the SBE should become a full-time, state-paid position as soon as possible and that the functions of the SBCC and BG-UNC be assigned to the SBE.

What would a full-time, state-paid member of the SBE do? It is important to put into context what the *State Constitution* already requires of the SBE: "to ... supervise and administer the free public school system and the educational funds provided for its support ...." The thirteen members of the SBE are composed of the Lt. Governor and the State Treasurer, who are already in full-time, state-paid positions, and eleven other members appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly in joint session. The *State Constitution* requires the General Assembly to divide the state into eight educational districts, with one SBE member to be appointed from each district and with three members to be appointed from the state at large.

Under the proposal of this recommendation, each SBE member would consult with citizens, visit schools, community colleges, universities, and other such agencies in his district. In a word, the SBE member would become "educated" about the educational needs in the district and the state at large. When meetings of the Board are held, the Board members should be better able to fulfill the constitutional obligations assigned to the SBE.

This recommendation that the SBE members hold full-time, state paid positions is not unlike the current arrangement for State Utility Commissioners. They are in full-time, state paid positions. Surely the setting of standards of quality for education in this state is as important as setting the rates for utilities! Moreover, not to have a unified system of education would be akin to having a statewide transportation system where one state department would be responsible for the primary roads (comparable to the primary/elementary schools today under the SBE); another state department responsible for secondary roads (comparable to the secondary schools today under the SBE with support for some elementary and secondary school efforts by the SBCC); and yet another state department responsible for interstate roads (comparable to the universities under the BG-UNC).

The Council believes a statement that best describes its philosophy was reported in the spring 1987 issue of the NEA Higher Education Journal, (p.79):

> We conclude that education is a seamless web. We are all citizens of a common community, a mutual enterprise, with a joint purpose.

Another statement that supports The Council's philosophy of education is contained in an article in the North Carolina Education Magazine, September-October 1987, written by Lloyd V. Hackley, then Vice President for Student Services and Special Projects (now President of Fayetteville State University), and George A. Antonelli, Associate Vice President for Student Services and Special Projects of The University of North Carolina:

> Among other changes necessary, the educational system must be viewed as a single continuum from kindergarten through graduate school, and students must be made to understand that competence gained at lower levels in the school system influences their performance at subsequent levels. (p.10).

Accordingly, THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE GOVERNOR REQUEST THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO ENACT LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ASSIGN THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO HOLD FULL-TIME, STATE-PAID POSITIONS.

CONSTITUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA

ARTICLE IX

EDUCATION

Section 1. *Education encouraged.* Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, libraries, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Sec. 2. *Uniform system of schools.*

(1) *General and uniform system; term.* The General Assembly shall provide by taxation and otherwise for a general and uniform system of free public schools, which shall be maintained at least nine months in every year, and wherein equal opportunities shall be provided for all students.

(2) *Local responsibility.* The General Assembly may assign to units of local government such responsibility for the financial support of the free public schools as it may deem appropriate. The governing boards of units of local government with financial responsibility for public education may use local revenues to add to or supplement any public school or post-secondary school program.

Sec. 3. *School attendance.* The General Assembly shall provide that every child of appropriate age and of sufficient mental and physical ability shall attend the public schools, unless educated by other means.

Sec. 4. *State Board of Education.*

(1) *Board.* The State Board of Education shall consist of the Lieutenant Governor, the Treasurer, and eleven members appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly in joint session. The General Assembly shall divide the State into eight educational districts. Of the appointive members of the Board, one shall be appointed from each of the eight educational districts and three shall be appointed from the State at large. Appointments shall be for overlapping terms of eight years. Appointments to fill vacancies shall be made by the Governor for the unexpired terms and shall not be subject to confirmation.

(2) *Superintendent of Public Instruction.* The Superintendent of Public Instructiuon shall be the secretary and chief administrative officer of the State Board of Education.

Sec. 5. *Powers and duties of Board.* The State Board of Education shall supervise and administer the free public school system and the educational funds provided for its support, except the funds mentioned in Section 7 of this Article, and shall make all needed rules and regulations in relation thereto, subject to laws enacted by the General Assembly.

Sec. 6. *State school fund.* The proceeds of all lands that have been or hereafter may be granted by the United States to this State, and not otherwise appropriated by this State or the United States; all moneys, stocks, bonds, and other property belonging to the State for purposes of public education; the net proceeds of all sales of the swamp lands belonging to the State; and all other grants, gifts, and devises that have been or hereafter may be made to the State, and not otherwise appropriated by the State or by the terms of the grant, gift, or devise, shall be paid into the State Treasury and, together with so much of the revenue of the State as may be set apart for that purpose, shall be faithfully appropriated and used exclusively for establishing and maintaining a uniform system of free public schools.

Sec. 7. *County school fund.* All moneys, stocks, bonds, and other property belonging to a county school fund, and the clear proceeds of all penalties and forfeitures and of all fines collected in the several counties for any breach of the penal laws of the State, shall belong to and remain in the several counties, and shall be faithfully appropriated and used exclusively for maintaining free public schools.

Sec. 8. *Higher education.* The General Assembly shall maintain a public system of higher education, comprising The University of North Carolina and such other institutions of higher education as the General Assembly may deem wise. The General Assembly shall provide for the selection of trustees of The University of North Carolina and of the other institutions of higher education, in whom shall be vested all the privileges, rights, franchises, and endowments heretofore granted to or conferred upon the trustees of these institutions. The General Assembly may enact laws necessary and expedient for the maintenance and management of The University of North Carolina and the other public institutions of higher education.

Sec. 9. *Benefits of public institutions of higher education.* The General Assembly shall provide that the benefits of The University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense.

Sec. 10. *Escheats.*

(1) *Escheats prior to July 1, 1971.* All property that prior to July 1, 1971, accrued to the State from escheats, unclaimed dividends, or distributive shares of the estates of deceased persons shall be appropriated to the use of The University of North Carolina.

(2) *Escheats after June 30, 1971.* All property that, after June 30, 1971, shall accrue to the State from escheats, unclaimed dividends or distributive shares of the estates of deceased persons shall be used to aid worthy and needy students who are residents of this State and are enrolled in public institutions of higher education in this State. The method, amount, and type of distribution shall be prescribed by law.

Attachment I

Attachment II

CITATIONS THAT UNDERGIRD THE RECOMMENDATION OF THIS PAPER

- The Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1986-87 of the State Treasurer reveals that "... we now spend some 73 per cent of our General Fund tax money on all levels of education" (p. 1).

- According to a paper released by the United Way of America of 1987 entitled "What Lies Ahead: Looking Toward the 90s," this statement in the section headed "Changing Work Force and World of Work":

  > ... vocational training and education will be a life long pursuit for those who want to continue to improve themselves and advance professionally. New developments in technology and increased international competition have created a growing need for a flexible work force, one that is well trained and versatile.

- In a report to the 1987 General Assembly entitled North Carolina Capital Markets Innovation Plan, (p.63), the following statement is reported under a heading of Patent Policy:

  > North Carolina will never harness the full economic power of its universities, its large number of Ph.D's, its private industries, its financial sector and its economic development policies unless it develops policies that remove barriers to collaboration.

- According to a report, The North Carolina Community College Study, prepared by the Research Triangle Institute in 1986, for the SBCC:

  > The Board members are concerned about their limited interaction with the State Board of Education and the University System Board of Governors, and express constructive interest in better articulation with these authorities on matters on mutual concern (p.91).

  Several of the "principal findings and conclusions" of the Study were:

  > ... there are mixed evaluations, by those involved and other parties, on the current strength and effectiveness of the State Board (p.130).
  >
  > We conclude that the System needs a strong and centralized governance authority ... (p.130).

- According to the National Alliance of Business in a 1986 report entitled "Employment Policies: Looking to the Year 2000," (p.10) this recommendation for every state:

  > There should be a board ... at the state level ... that would be responsible for coordinating all training, education, economic development and placement activities in the state."

- According to the Governor of Arkansas, in an article published in the March/April 1987 issue of The Council of State Governments, (p.62), this statement:

  > To meet the challenge before us, education must go through a second wave of reform .... To capture the essence of what now needs to be done, education has borrowed a buzz word from corporate America: restructuring.

- According to an article entitled "Class of 2000 arrives," in the Education Report, issued by the Department of Public Instruction, (September 1987, (p.2)), this statement by an Associate Director of the Division of Vocational Education, who is a co-author of the book Schools of the Future:

  > One of the most significant educational factors for this class of the year 2000 is the need for a total integrated academic and technical curriculum. A strong liberal arts education will not be enough; all of them will need an understanding of computers, lasers, telecommunications' systems, and how to find, use, and keep information current through the use of data bases, online service, and other sources. Business, industry, and society will require people to be both educated and trained; one will not suffice and the costs for remediation of basic education will be prohibitive as the need increases to provide literacy training for adults. The major challenge for education policy makers is to redesign the curriculum to address both academic and technical education. Graduates today and tomorrow will continue to be at the low end of the employment scale with only a liberal arts degree.

- The report of the North Carolina Commission on Jobs and Economic Growth (November 12, 1987, p.14) states:

  > ... by 1990, three out of four jobs will require education or technical training beyond high school.

- In the Fall/Winter, 1987 issue of Planning for Higher Education, the current State President of the Community College System, and a former Governor, was asked the following question:

  > With such a large proportion of funding from the state, the other publicly funded educational systems in the state (i.e., the university system and the public school system) are a key part of your competitive environment. How do these systems currently relate to each other?

  The State President's answer, in part, was:

  > Haphazardly at best, I'm afraid. I've been in this role now for four years, and it's apparent that there is no linkage between planning as we do within our system and what happens in the statewide effort for higher education or in education generally ....

- In the September, 1988 issue of the Kappan Magazine, an article entitled: "Restructuring the System is the Solution" (p. 20) states: "The U.S. educational system is at a crossroads. A business-as-usual approach to education policy --and even to reform-- will lead to an increasingly troubled future for both education and the economy."

SECTION 15

We can't stress quality enough.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE), THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES (SBCC), AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY (BG-UNC) DEVELOP A COMBINED PLAN WHICH WILL ADDRESS THE PREPARATION OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL TEACHERS NOW AND IN THE FUTURE AND PRESENT THE FUNDING OF THE COMBINED PLAN TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IF NECESSARY.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

The 1988 General Assembly, with the enactment of House Bill 245 (Chapter 1102), mandated that the SBE, the SBCC, and the BG-UNC "... shall meet ... at least once a year to discuss educational matters of mutual interest ...." Indeed, this Act further requires that a meeting be held in 1988 and each year thereafter (see attachment of House Bill 245).

This joint meeting of these three statewide boards comes very close to achieving some of the purposes the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," had in mind when it recommended in February, 1988 that the functions of SBCC and the BG-UNC be assigned to the SBE so that policy actions regarding public education might be made in a consistent, integrated fashion. The Council calls further attention to that recommendation.

Now that House Bill 245 is law, The Council sees a real possibility, for the first time ever, for the three statewide education boards to develop consistent policies for public education. No coordinated policy initiative is more important than the preparation of teachers for the immediate and long-term future. In the preparation of teachers, no area is in greater need of attention than prospective vocational-technical teachers. The facts regarding the need to improve vocational-technical teachers, not only in the public schools but also in the community colleges, as well as in a number of other state agencies which offer vocational-technical education programs, has been documented by The Council for nearly two decades. The most recent documentation affecting public school vocational education teachers, for example, was presented in a August, 1988 "White Paper" entitled "THE RESULTS OF THE DECLARATIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ABOUT VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION OVER THE LAST DECADE ADD UP TO BE ADMINISTRATIVE 'BENIGN NEGLECT' BY THE OFFICIALS OF THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION." As this "White Paper" reveals, part of the problem in preparing vocational education teachers as well as technical education teachers has been the independence of each statewide board to operate without a coordinated strategy with the other education boards. Thanks to House Bill 245, a mechanism is now in place so that the coordination of teacher preparation is not only a possibility, but the General Assembly has directed the SBE, the SBCC, and the BG-UNC "... to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this state (underlining for emphasis).

In order to enhance the role of prospective vocational-technical teachers, The Council believes that the following prior recommendations are essential as a beginning point:

> That the SBE and the SBCC require all vocational/technical teachers to take an appropriate test, if available, through the National Occupational Competency Testing Institute (NOCTI) before a local board of education/trustees, respectfully, may employ a teacher using federal and/or state funds and for both the SBE and the SBCC to petition the Board of Governors to require the constituent institutions to accept the NOCTI test results in granting college credit, with the number of earned credits to be determined, in joint action, by the constituent institutions (adopted August 28, 1987);
>
> That the SBE conduct a review of all vocational teacher education programs and the professional certification procedures for all vocational teachers in the state and that the SBE request the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina and the SBCC to assist with this effort to the end that no later than the Fall of 1993 the SBE will be in a position to implement consistent standards for employment that, as a minimum, will require all prospective teachers to complete an approved degree program before they are hired by local boards of education (adopted on November 20, 1987); and

> That the SBCC establish a minimum educational employment standard, to become operative no later than 1993, for vocational/technical faculty members hired by institutions of the community college system and that the SBCC request the assistance of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina to cause the constituent institutions to prepare faculty members to meet the educational standard set by the SBCC (adopted on November 20, 1987).

Indeed, if the above recommendations to improve and enhance the role and functions of vocational-technical teachers now and in the future are to take place, a COMBINED PLAN between and among these three public statewide education boards is essential. Moreover, it seems clear to The Council, with the shortages identified in the vocational-technical teaching ranks as well as the lack of a degree by some of the current vocational-technical teachers, a massive training and retraining staff development effort is essential, necessitating funds from the General Assembly and/or redirection of funds available through the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, as amended. In making the recommendation of the paper, The Council wishes to point out that this recommendation might not have been necessary if The Education of North Carolina's Teachers, a report to the 1987 General Assembly, presented by the BG-UNC, had not ignored the nondegreed teachers in the public schools which represents about fifteen percent (15%) of the currently employed vocational education teachers. Also, the BG-UNC, beginning with the Fall of 1989, is insisting on a "second academic major" for all teachers, a policy that is not supported by the SBE. Moreover, in this effort to "improve" teacher preparation in this state, the SBCC has been entirely left out of the equation.

Accordingly, THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE), THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES (SBCC), AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY (BG-UNC) DEVELOP A COMBINED PLAN WHICH WILL ADDRESS THE SHORTAGE OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL TEACHERS NOW AND IN

THE FUTURE AND PRESENT THE FUNDING OF THE COMBINED PLAN TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IF NECESSARY.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
1987 SESSION
RATIFIED BILL

CHAPTER 1102
HOUSE BILL 245

AN ACT TO REQUIRE THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS TO MEET JOINTLY AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR.

The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

Section 1. G.S. 115C-11 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

"(b1) Annual meeting with the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina. The State Board of Education shall meet with the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina at least once a year to discuss educational matters of mutual interest and to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this State. The meeting in 1987 and every three years thereafter shall be hosted by the University Board of Governors, the meeting in 1988 and every three years thereafter shall be hosted by the State Board of Education, and the meeting in 1989 and every three years thereafter shall be hosted by the State Board of Community Colleges."

Sec. 2. G.S. 115D-2.1(g) is amended by adding after the first sentence the following:

"The State Board of Community Colleges shall also meet with the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina at least once a year to discuss educational matters of mutual interest and to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this State; these joint meetings shall be hosted by the three Boards according to the schedule set out in G.S. 115C-11(b1)."

Sec. 3. G.S. 116-9 is amended by adding after the first sentence the following:

"The Board of Governors shall also meet with the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges at least once a year to discuss educational matters of mutual interest and to recommend to the General Assembly such policies as are appropriate to encourage the improvement of public education at every level in this State; these joint meetings shall be hosted by the three Boards according to the schedule set out in G.S. 115C-11(b1)."

Sec. 4. This act shall become effective July 1, 1987.

In the General Assembly read three times and ratified this the 12th day of July, 1988.

ROBERT B. JORDAN III

Robert B. Jordan III
President of the Senate

LISTON B. RAMSEY

Liston B. Ramsey
Speaker of the House of Representatives

SECTION 16

We need a strong, unified administration to spend our money efficiently.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, TO THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, AND TO THE NORTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES THAT THEY EACH ENDORSE THE CONCEPT THAT ALL OF THE STATE-ADMINISTERED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS BE BROUGHT TOGETHER INTO ONE AGENCY.

Adopted on November 18, 1988

$406,746,236!!! That's how much financial aid was awarded to students attending postsecondary education institutions throughout the State of North Carolina during 1986-87. This amount of approximately $406.7 million is a combined total of various types of student financial aid as is shown in the Appendix. This total amount of financial aid, as well as the amount of funds for different types of aid, is both substantial and impressive.

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," has been concerned about the reported reduction in student financial aid and sought to determine the impact of the reduction on the students in the state. The Council's findings are shown in the Appendix. The bottom line is that student financial aid is not being reduced in the state. Total financial aid for students attending postsecondary education in the state has increased from slightly more than $326 million in 1982-83 to more than $406 million in 1986-87 or an increase of slightly more than $80 million in the last five years.

Why is this information important? First, according to following sources, these conclusions:

> "By 1990, more than 50% of all jobs will require education or technical training beyond high school." (Source: National Alliance of Business as reported in Business Week, May 2, 1988.)

> "... [By] 1990, three out of four jobs will require education or technical training beyond high school." (Source: North Carolina Commission on Jobs and Economic Growth, November 12, 1986, p. 14.)

Indeed, according to an article entitled "Illiteracy hampering South's progress, report says," in the October 6, 1988 News and Observer (p. 30-A), the following is reported: "Local officials at IBM say that soon even entry-level jobs at their facilities will require two years of postsecondary education ...." It is important, therefore, for prospective students in North Carolina who desire to attend postsecondary education to be able to easily access student financial aid, if it is needed in order to attend.

Second, this information about student financial aid is important because currently there are eight major statewide entities that manage one or more student financial aid programs. The Governor has endorsed the concept that these entities should be brought together in one agency. Yet, the State Board of Education, the State Board of Community Colleges, the Board of Governors and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities have not responded affirmatively to an earlier recommendation of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education to consolidate these state-administered student financial aid programs into one agency. Accordingly, this recommendation is made again TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, TO THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, AND TO THE NORTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES THAT THEY EACH ENDORSE THE CONCEPT THAT ALL OF THE STATE-ADMINISTERED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS BE BROUGHT TOGETHER INTO ONE AGENCY.

APPENDIX

TREND IN TOTAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
By Totals: 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86, and 1986-87

FOR	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
Undergraduate Study	$187,054,581	$203,009,271	$214,646,364	$234,889,550	$241,392,924
First Professional	6,832,358	7,737,639	9,723,749	10,163,721	12,433,118
Graduate Study	43,210,586	53,143,407	53,029,619	46,583,977	64,159,564
Subtotals A	$237,097,525	$263,890,317	$277,399,732	$291,637,248	*$317,985,606
Vocational Rehab	$(486,729)	$(479,301)	$(563,048)	$(693,243)	$(758,825)
Veterans Benefits	(44,427,281)	(33,886,984)	(30,876,484)	(28,175,803)	(23,090,460)
Out-of-State Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL)	(30,013,628)	(31,135,698)	(32,475,357)	(35,894,887)	(35,508,247)
Plus Loans	(414,710)	(1,429,228)	(2,072,132)	(4,598,495)	(1,757,412)
Other Loans	Not reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	(7,118,990)
Other Financial Aid	74,927,638	65,501,983	65,987,021	69,362,428	**$ 68,233,934)
N.C. Legislative Grants (NCLTG)	14,132,625	15,957,550	18,161,429	19,523,008	***20,526,696
Subtotals B	$ 89,060,263	$ 81,459,533	$ 84,148,450	$ 88,885,436	$ 88,760,630
GRAND TOTALS	$326,157,788	$345,349,850	$361,548,182	$380,522,684	$406,746,236

Note: Parenthetical entries show a breakdown of Other Financial Aid.

*See Attachment I for details in 1986-87.
**See Attachment II for details in 1986-87.
***See Attachment III for details in 1986-87.

Sources: Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1983.
Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1984.
Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1985.
Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1986.
Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1987.
Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, April 1988.
Data for "Other Financial Aid" was provided by the State Education Assistance Authority (SEAA).
A Look at Student Financial Aid in North Carolina, adopted by the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, August 29, 1986

Attachment I

Financial Aid Support for 1986-87 Using Data in the "Student Financial Aid" Section of the *Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina*, April 1988

	Federal/ State Funded	Private or Institutional Funded	Total
(For Undergraduate Study)			
Work-Study (W/S):	$ 13,531,697+	$ 18,868,545	$ 32,400,242
Athletic Support:	-0-	16,724,937	16,724,937
Supplementary Education Opportunity Grants (SEOG):	8,851,193	-0-	8,851,193
N.C. Student Incentive Grants (NCSIG):	3,146,299	-0-	3,146,299
Other Scholarships, Grants, Awards (Non-athletic):	-0-	62,275,752*	62,275,752
Pell Grants:	50,372,293	-0-	50,372,293
Perkins Loans (NDSL):	14,943 191	-0-	14,943,191
Guaranteed Loan Program:	40,626,313	-0-	40,626,313
Plus Loan Program:	1,869,847	-0-	1,869,847
Supplemental Loans for Students:	876,823	-0-	876,823
Other Loans:	-0-	9,306,034*	9,306,034
Subtotal	$134,217,656	$107,175,268	$241,392,924
(For First Professional)			
Health Professions Grants:	$ 58,702**	$ -0-	$ 58,702
Other Scholarships:	-0-	8,001,779**	8,001,779
Health Professions Loans:	488,002	-0-	488,002
Other Loans:	2,419,923**	-0-	2,419,923
Employment:	-0-	1,464,712**	1,464,712
Subtotal	$ 2,966,627	$ 9,466,491	$ 12,433,118
(For Graduate Study)			
Fellowships, Traineeships, Grants, & Scholarships:	$ 13,452,442*	$ -0-	$ 13,452,442
Assistantships:	-0-	33,683,174*	33,683,174
Loans:	1,558,122*	-0-	1,558,122
Employment:	-0-	15,465,826*	15,465,826
Subtotal	$ 15,010,564	$ 49,149,000	$ 64,159,564
Subtotals:			
For Undergraduate Study:	$134,217,656	$107,175,268	$241,392,924
For First Professional:	2,966,627	9,466,491	12,433,118
For Graduate Study:	15,010,564	49,149,000	64,159,564
TOTAL	$152,194,847	$165,790,759	$317,985,606

*Abstract does not identify the source of these funds.

**Includes aid for undergraduate nursing.

+This amount likely includes a 20% matching requirement from local institutions' resources.

Educational Benefit or Assistance Programs not Traditionally Reported in Section IX (Student Financial Aid) of the Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina

Academic Year 1986-87

****

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION		VETERANS BENEFITS		OUT-OF-STATE GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS (GSL)		PLUS LOANS		OTHER LOANS	
	Number of Students	Amount Received	Number of Students	Amount Received	Number of Borrowers	Amount Borrowed	Number of Borrowers	Amount Borrowed	Number of Borrowers	Amount Borrowed
UNC System	339	$269,040	2,242	$ 6,026,947	7,012	$16,342,278	390	$1,041,222	2,353	$1,915,843
Private Colleges	88	144,567	408	829,554	6,736	18,105,381	268	711,190	1,707	3,426,943
Community Colleges & Technical Institutes	997	345,218	5,110	16,233,959	553	1,060,588	2	5,000	3,685	1,776,204
Total	1,424	$758,825	7,760	$23,090,460	14,301	$35,508,247	660	$1,757,412	7,745	$7,118,990

****

SOURCE: NCHED A-10, Student Financial Aid Summary, 7/1/86-6/30/87.

NOTE: Veterans Benefits also include GI Benefits; Vocational Rehabilitation includes all rehabilitation benefits related to the cost of schooling.

CAVEAT: Two of the educational programs of financial support shown in this table are not classified properly as student financial aid. Vocational Rehabilitation and Veterans Benefit programs are educational support provided to specialized constituencies designed to enhance educational opportunities for the handicapped and veterans. Guaranteed student loans (now renamed Stafford Loans) require that financial need be proved. PLUS loans were established by Congress to help families with assets but a poor cash-flow position to meet the cost of education for their children. PLUS loans receive a Federal guarantee but no subsidy. Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS) are included in the PLUS loan column. Other loans include loans from a variety of sources as reported by the schools.

Data shown in this table are as reported by the institutions on year-end reporting form NCHED A-10. Because of inconsistencies that arise in data collection, these data customarily are not reported in the Statistical Abstract of Higher Education. The number of students served and the amount of money spent, however, is illustrative of the magnitude of support from these programs received by students within the various institutional sectors during a twelve-month period. The annual receipts from these programs as shown here are probably understated.

Attachment II

Attachment III

NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATIVE TUITION GRANTS (NCLTG), 1986-87

INSTITUTION	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS AIDED	TOTAL AMOUNT PROVIDED
PRIVATE SENIOR INSTITUTIONS		
Atlantic Christian	865	$793,500
Barber-Scotia	192	162,000
Belmont Abbey	315	289,500
Bennett	255	233,500
Campbell	1,433	1,255,374
Catawba	475	431,000
Davidson	418	397,670
Duke	828	791,500
Elon	1,200	1,079,500
Gardner-Webb	1,073	841,491
Greensboro	287	256,500
Guilford	656	580,000
High Point	755	571,700
Johnson C. Smith	437	379,500
Lenoir-Rhyne	933	847,500
Livingstone	335	291,500
Mars Hill	753	623,966
Meredith	1,323	1,257,500
Methodist	1,250	837,582
Montreat-Anderson	212	192,500
Mount Olive	537	442,243
N.C. Wesleyan	567	367,670
Pfeiffer	437	397,500
Queens	186	160,500
Sacred Heart	203	160,000
St. Andrews	324	304,000
St. Augustine's	818	707,500
Salem	335	306,000
Shaw	984	807,500
Wake Forest	1,396	1,344,000
Warren Wilson	184	163,000
Wingate	1,156	1,031,000
Private Senior Total	21,122	18,304,196
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES		
Brevard	277	250,000
Chowan	405	356,500
Lees-McRae	489	422,500
Louisburg	710	622,500
Peace	437	428,000
St. Mary's	151	142,000
Private Junior Total	2,469	2,221,500
GRAND TOTAL	23,591	20,525,696*

*The total amount provided recipients does not reflect program refunds.

NOTE: The allocations above were made under the North Carolina Legislative Tuition Grant (NCLTG) program which is administered by the North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority. The General Assembly appropriated $20,929,000 to be awarded on the basis of $1,000 to each North Carolinian enrolled in a North Carolina private college or university on a full-time basis. The NCLTG awards are paid to institutions for and on behalf of eligible students each term as defined under NCLTG Regulations.

SECTION 17

There's no way around accountability.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES CERTIFY ANNUALLY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, TO EACH LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AND TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC THE STATUS OF EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTITUTION IN MEETING THE MAJOR PURPOSE SET FORTH IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT, SECTION 115D-1.

Adopted on February 17, 1989

The Community College Act as originally enacted by the General Assembly in 1963 provided that the institutions offer comprehensive educational programs. In 1969, the General Assembly amended in part the "Statement of Purpose" in Article I (G.S. 115D-1) to add "The major purpose of each and every institution operating under the provisions of this Chapter shall be and shall continue to be the offering of vocational and technical education and training, and of basic, high school level, academic education needed in order to profit from vocational and technical education, for students ...."

The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter referred to as "The Council," believes that the community college system, within available resources, is meeting the original purpose as well as the amended purpose set forth in current state law. Nevertheless, The Council recommends that the State Board of Community Colleges, hereinafter referred to as the "State Board," verify the compliance of each institution with the major statutory purpose and certify the results every year to the General Assembly, to each local board of trustees, and to the general public.

The Council believes that the verification and certification process would accomplish the following:

- Reassure the legislature and the public at large that the community college mission is being duly executed as set forth by state law;
- Lay to rest questions about community colleges straying from their assigned mission;
- Encourage community college trustees and personnel to focus on the major purpose of the institutions as prescribed in the "Community College Act;"

- Assist The Council in the advocacy of vocational and technical education in North Carolina; and

- Serve as a means of program accountability for the State Board to the General Assembly.

As it was The Council that recommended in 1986 that all of the community colleges become such by name and inasmuch as the 1987 General Assembly acted to permit institutions of the community college system to become that by name, and inasmuch as all of the institutions of the community college system have become community colleges by name except one, The Council believes it is now appropriate to make the recommendation of this paper. Accordingly, the STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES CERTIFY ANNUALLY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, TO EACH LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AND TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC THE STATUS OF EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTITUTION IN MEETING THE MAJOR PURPOSE SET FORTH IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT, SECTION 115D-1.

SECTION 18

The State Board of Education needs to state its mission.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE RECENTLY ELECTED STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION RECOMMEND THE ATTACHED "MISSION STATEMENT" TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR ITS CONSIDERATION.

Adopted on February 17, 1989

If the State Department of Public Instruction does not know where it is going, any road will be acceptable. Because the State Department of Public Instruction needs to know where it is going, the recently suggested "Purpose" and "Missions" by the State Superintendent is commendable. To compliment the State Superintendent's "Purpose" and "Missions" statements, the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," recommends that the newly elected State Superintendent recommend the attached "Mission Statement" to the State Board of Education for its consideration.

This "Mission Statement" was first offered to the State Board of Education in February, 1988. Insofar as can be ascertained, no attention has been given the recommendation by the State Board of Education. It is time, therefore, for the State Board of Education to consider this recommendation. It is especially timely in relationship to the State Superintendent's public "Remarks" to the Department Staff of January 9, 1989. In his remarks, the State Superintendent identified a number of initiatives for the Department. The Council believes the attached "Mission Statement" could be the umbrella under which the State Board of Education should operate in order to assist the newly elected State Superintendent in achieving his public stated objectives.

Accordingly, THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE RECENTLY ELECTED STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION RECOMMEND THE ATTACHED "MISSION STATEMENT" TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR ITS CONSIDERATION.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE) ADOPT THE FOLLOWING AS ITS "MISSION STATEMENT" AND PETITION THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO ENACT IT:

The Mission of the State Board of Education is to Provide Overall Policy Direction to Local Boards of Education to the End of Creating a Comprehensive Public School System That Graduates Good Citizens With Skills Demanded in the Marketplace and the Skills Necessary to Cope With Contemporary Society, Using Federal, State, Local, and Other Funds in the Most Cost-Effective Manner.

Adopted February 19, 1988

A "Mission Statement" is a key element for many well-known and successful corporations, organizations, and agencies. Yet, the SBE has not adopted its "Mission Statement." The State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, hereinafter called "The Council," believes that the SBE - and the public schools which receive policy and fiscal directions from the SBE - would function more effectively if a "Mission Statement" was publicly expressed so everyone would be aware of it.

The aforementioned "Mission Statement" is recommended by The Council. This "Mission Statement" closely parallels a 1984 action by the General Assembly when the "educational reform" legislation was passed. Language in that legislative enactment (House Bill 1567, Chapter 1103) declared that:

> It is the policy of the State of North Carolina to create a public school system that graduates good citizens with the skills demanded in the marketplace, and the skills necessary to cope with contemporary society, using state, local and other funds in the most cost-effective manner.

This legislation, however, was not subsequently incorporated as a part of the Public School Code. Thus, The Council now recommends a "Mission Statement" for the SBE, and that the SBE petition the General Assembly to enact the "Mission Statement" and to make it a part of the General Statutes, utilizing the earlier 1984 legislative policy mission as the model.

This proposed "Mission Statement" should compliment the Basic Education Program (BEP) by assuring the public of the overall efforts of the BEP and by providing an overall goal for the SBE. Moreover, the adoption of the foregoing "Mission Statement" by the SBE should strengthen the efforts of the board to the end of assisting the SBE with its prime constitutional duty to "... supervise and administer the free public school system and the educational funds provided for its support ... (North Carolina Constitution, Article IX, Sec. 5). As importantly, the proposed "Mission Statement" would also compliment one of the State Constitution's "Declaration of Rights;" namely, that: "The people have a right to the privilege of education, and it is the duty of the state to guard and maintain that right" (Sec. 15).

On January 7, 1988, a new Chairman of the SBE, Howard Haworth, was elected by the members of the board. One of his first reported statements was that the SBE should "... carve out a strong statement on who we are and what we stand for" (News and Observer, January 8, 1988, p. 18c). The Council agrees by recommending a "Mission Statement" as a response to the newly elected chairman. Such a recommendation is consistent with one of duties of The Council as assigned by the Congress, to "... advise the State Board and make reports to the Governor, the business community, and the general public of the State, concerning — (A) policies the State should pursue to strengthen vocational education ..." (P.L. 98-524, as amended, Sec. 112 (d)(3)).

Therefore, the Governor, the business community, and the general public are requested by The Council to endorse the recommendation THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (SBE) ADOPT THE FOLLOWING AS ITS "MISSION STATEMENT" AND PETITION THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO ENACT IT:

The Mission of the State Board of Education is to Provide Overall Policy Direction to Local Boards of Education to the End of Creating a Comprehensive Public School System That Graduates Good Citizens With Skills Demanded in the Marketplace and the Skills Necessary to Cope With Contemporary Society, Using Federal, State, Local, and Other Funds in the Most Cost-Effective Manner.

SECTION 19

People out in the field are the real experts on educational needs.

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

530 NORTH WILMINGTON STREET
WATSON HOUSE
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27604
(919) 733-2064

CHARLIE WIYGUL
CHAIRMAN

E. MICHAEL LATTA
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

February 17, 1989

The Honorable James G. Martin
Governor of North Carolina
State Capitol
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Dear Governor Martin:

First, let me thank you for your service to this state and its people. It is a pleasure to have an opportunity to work with you to improve education in general and vocational education in particular.

Second, as you know, one of the duties of the State Advisory Council is to give you, the Governor, advice on matters that it thinks will have substantial impact on improving vocational/technical education. In this regard, it is the view of The Council that significant progress can be made if you will continue to appoint business and/or industrial leaders to the State Board of Education and to the State Board of Community Colleges.

As you are aware, on or about April 1, 1989, you are required by the General Statutes to appoint two (2) individuals to be members of the State Board of Education, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. The Council believes it would be desirable for you to appoint business and/or industrial leaders to fill the two positions on the State Board of Education. Accordingly, The Council recommends this action by you.

Likewise, on or before June 30, 1989, the General Statutes require you to appoint three (3) individuals to the State Board of Community Colleges. In addition, to these 3 individuals there is also one current vacancy on the Board for you to fill. Again, The Council recommends that you appoint or reappoint individuals with strong business and/or industrial interest in this state.

The Council believes that these education boards will respond to the needs of the people and consider the future job possibilities when most of the members of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges are business and/or industrial leaders. Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

My best to you.

Sincerely,

Charlie Wiygul

CW:vjs

—Major Duty: To Enhance Vocational and Technical Education—

SECTION 20

Are the purposes of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl D. Perkins Act being fulfilled?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education is required by federal statute under the Carl D. Perkins Vocatioanal Education Act (P.L. 98-524) to evaluate at least once every two years--

1) The vocational education program delivery systems assisted under this Act, and under the Job Training Partnership Act, in terms of their adequacy and effectiveness in achieving the purposes of each of the two Acts and

2) Make recommendations to the State Board on the adequacy and effectiveness of the coordination that takes place between vocational education and the Job Training Partnership Act and

3) Advise the Governor, the State Board, the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Labor of these findings and recommendations. (Section 112[d][9])

This latest biennial review encompasses the 1986-1988 period (July 1, 1986 through June 30, 1988).

APPROACH

This study has gathered and analyzed program performance data for the two funding systems (Carl Perkins and JTPA) within North Carolina over the two-year period including published plans, status reports, established performance standards, and other documentary evidence of program effectiveness and efficiency. The study has cross-referenced performance data with a variety of surveys to solicit candid response from vocational education and training practitioners across the State on their perception of the adequacy and effectiveness of each system, the actual coordination taking place between the two systems, and observed strengths and weaknesses at the local level. In addition to quantifiable data, these surveys asked for suggestions and recommendations to improve the separate systems. The study has also solicited and drawn-out from a variety of sources those "exemplary" programs of coordination between recipients of Carl Perkins and Job Training Partnership Act funds. These examples of effective program delivery may be one of the most valuable assets of this research.

FINDINGS

The vocational education program delivery systems assisted under the Carl D.

Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act in North Carolina are varied and multiple in their organizational structure, performance accomplishments, efficiency and effectiveness. These systems are multifaceted, overlapping and pluralistic. Overall, the study has revealed that the major systems have been adequate and effective in meeting the purposes of the two Acts over the past two program years. There are also numerous examples of effective coordination between and with the education community administering both Carl Perkins and Job Training Partnership Act funds and the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Moreover, the State's Division of Employment and Training, Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, the Division of Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, and the Department of Community Colleges have provided, for the most part, creative leadership in working towards better coordination. However, there is definitely evidence of some Service Delivery Areas, some community colleges, and some public schools which have been less than adequate, less than effective, and less than responsive in supporting and contributing toward mutual coordination over the past two years. On the other end of the performance continuum, there are numbers of exemplary programs operating in North Carolina, commendable and award winning programs, that should be shared with others. Both State and local efforts to monitor and improve individual systems as well as to coordinate between the others is commendable.

Our overall impression then is that North Carolina has a dynamic, growing and changing vocational education delivery system that has actively sought over the past two years to fulfill the purposes of the Carl Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act but has gone beyond these requirements to meet the vocational needs of its citizens. The following suggestions and recommendations are an attempt to add to this ideal. (Please note that each recommendation is followed by its page reference in the complete text.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

* *That the Division of Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, consider including coordination requirements and cross-linkages specified or implied in both the Carl Perkins and Job Training Partnership Acts in its annual Vocational Development Program Assessment Instrument in order to support and encourage such active coordination and collaboration at the local high school level. (p. 23)*

* That the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges actively promote and seek to replicate effective exemplary projects throughout its educational systems as documented in its annual *Performance Reports for Program Years 1986-87* and *1987-88*. (p. 24)

* That strategies for economic development tied to vocational education as well as other programs designed to assess and raise vocational competency levels within depressed areas, e.g. literacy, upgrade skills, entrepreneur and apprenticeship training initiatives, be provided within the Division of Vocational Education's "consumers and homemakers" curriculum as an alternative strategy for vocational development within depressed areas of the State. (p. 24)

* That the local Vocational Education Director work closely with the Private Industry Council to identify economically disadvantaged students in the school system, those "at risk," most-in-need, potential dropouts, who have both economic and academic problems, in order to correctly identify and prescribe/deliver effective services to such needy students. (P. 25)

* That the Division of Vocational Education and the Division of Employment and Training, Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, work together to definitively address the question of the identification and recruitment of economically disadvantaged students within the public school system. Training workshops for Vocational Education Directors and appropriate school personnel (guidance counselors) would be helpful in developing both strategic planning initiatives as well as effective program delivery to economically disadvantaged students. (pp. 25-26)

* That the Divisions of Vocational Education and Employment and Training along with the Department of Community Colleges jointly develop with the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (SOICC) a strategic plan for implementing and training education and employment and training administrators in the effective use of labor market supply and demand data at the local level. It is further recommended that in order to assure the effective use of this important information that these State agencies work together:

    1) To support this professional development and expectations through appropriate incentives and sanctions;

    2) To provide self-evaluation and monitoring efforts to reinforce performance; and

    3) To legitimize this process through the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan.

    (p. 27)

* That the State Board of Education reexamine guidance and counseling initiatives as an expressed high priority need in North Carolina and that Carl Perkins Vocational Act funds as well as other available sources be fully utilized for this critically important purpose throughout the State's school systems. Since the Job Training Partnership Act requires systematic and documented assessment

and guidance and counseling of its participants, it is recommended that administrators of both JTPA and Carl Perkins funds explore joint, collaborative initiatives in this regard, where permissable. It is further recommended that whatever strategic planning has been done for guidance and counseling in the public schools (Master Plan) be implemented in a systematic fashion with full annual accountability to the State Board of Education. (pp. 28-29)

- *That the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges increase emphasis on sex-role stereotyping on occupations, job skills, levels of competency, and careers in planning and program development throughout the State in fulfillment of one of the purposes of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act and that a coordinated effort be made to increase local school support and student participation in this area of vocational education. (p. 31)*

- *That the State Board of Community Colleges and the State Job Training Coordinating Council review and examine the administration of Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act funds and Job Training Partnership Act funds at the community college level with a view toward assessing the feasibility of combining or coordinating these two functions in one administrative agent or lead person in each college. (p. 33)*

- *That the State Board of Education, State Board of Community Colleges and the State Job Training Coordinating Council, along with the North Carolina Private Industry Council Chair's Association, seek ways to increase broader involvement of the educational community with the Private Industry Council so that it accurately reflects and represents multiple educational interests throughout its jurisdiction. (p. 34)*

- *That an interagency newsletter sponsored by the State Vocational Education Planning and Coordination Committee be published periodically to disseminate information about vocational education coordination issues and activities throughout the State. (p. 37)*

- *That the State Board of Education, State Board of Community Colleges and the State Job Training Coordinating Council require staff to develop executive summaries for broader public use of all formal plans, grants, applications and other public documents. (p. 39)*

- *That Vocational Advisory Committees and Private Industry Councils seek to provide cross-representation in their organizations. (p. 39)*

- *That Vocational Education Directors and Community College administrators of Carl Perkins Act and Job Training Partnership Act funds be required as a part of their job description and regular duties to attend Private Industry Council meetings in their areas. (p. 40)*

- *That the State Board of Education, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the State Job Training Coordinating Council review current models of exemplary coordination between the vocational education and job training systems in North Carolina with a view toward making known and replicating these proven methods of coordination throughout the State. (p. 45)*

- *That the State Superintendent of Public Instruction consider placement of the JTPA (8% setaside) administration within the Division of Vocational Education and* *that the State Board of Community Colleges set up guidelines for community colleges to coordinate JTPA and Carl Perkins activities through an integrated administrative entity or agent at the local college level. (p. 45)*

- *That the Division of Vocational Education actively seek to invite JTPA program administrators to its summer program improvement workshop, both as selective presenters and as participants. (p. 46)*
- *That the Division of Vocational Education prepare a technical (how-to-do-it) manual on exemplary projects of coordination as referenced in its annual North Carolina Vocational Education Performance Report for dissemination to Service Delivery Areas and Carl Perkins administrators for possible replication. (p. 46)*
- *That the State Job Training Coordinating Council and the Governor review the State's configuration of Service Delivery Areas through an independent study designed to evaluate the most effective alignment of Service Delivery Areas for planning, coordination, service delivery, and evaluation of employment and training programs within the State. It is further recommended that such a study incorporate vocational education as an integral part of this determination and that this study be prepared in adequate time for the Governor to make whatever redesignation of SDAs he may desire in accordance with the prescriptions of the law. (p. 54)*
- *That the State Job Training Coordinating Council and the State Board of Education and the Community College Board undertake a major effort to formalize and implement policy guidance, program initiatives, and documented evaluation of those individuals "hardest-to-serve" within the education and employment and training systems in the State. It is further recommended that several model or pilot programs recruiting such participants and providing a competency-based, sequential training format be developed and tested as a joint effort supported by Carl Perkins and JTPA funds. (pp. 70-71)*
- *That the State Job Training Coordinating Council, State Board of Education, and the State Board of Community Colleges prepare and publish jointly an annual vocational education and employment and training needs analysis and assessment "to which employment and training, vocational education, rehabilitation services, public assistance, economic development, and other Federal, State, and local programs and services represent a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting such needs." (pp. 72-73)*
- *That the Department of Community Colleges along with the Division of Employment and Training prepare a formative evaluation of the effectiveness of the JTPA (8% setaside) funded Participant Services Centers operating in a majority of community colleges in the State and, as a part of this evaluation, explore the usefulness of such centralized resources for Carl Perkins programs and other JTPA related programs for youth and adults. (p. 74)*
- *That the State Board of Education develop a coordinated effort on the part of its constituent schools to encourage, support and provide technical assistance for the effective response to and pursuit of any available JTPA funds offered under competitive Request for Proposals, that, in order for this bidding not to be duplicative and disfunctional, that strategic planning be undertaken by local school districts to establish needs and priorities for such additional funding in coordination with other secondary and post-secondary school systems. (pp.76-77)*

* _That the Division of Employment and Training work with the educational community to resolve differences in timely allocation or notice (NFA) of JTPA funds in order to encourage greater local participation in JTPA and to minimize lag time in start-up of programs. (p. 77)_

* _That the State Board of Education, State Board of Community Colleges, and the State Job Training Coordinating Council commission an independent review of the current benefits, applications and liabilities of performance-based contracting under the Job Training Partnership Act with guidelines for its application and use by SDAs and other JTPA grantees in North Carolina. (p. 77-78)_

* _That the North Carolina Job Training Council publish in its Annual Report to the Governor detailed performance information on each of the Service Delivery Areas in the State including performance measures and specific results by each Service Delivery Area. (p. 79)_

* _That the Division of Vocational Education be invited to participate with the State Job Training Coordinating Council in the further development of competency-based programs with and for Service Delivery Areas. (p. 80)_

* _That the State Job Training Coordinating Council seek to obtain research and evaluation data from the Service Delivery Areas on the relative 'quality' and upward mobility prospects of their job placements and that the Evaluation Committee of the Council consider establishing an incentive award for such effective performance. (p. 80)_

* _That the Interagency Coordinating Committee of the State Job Training Coordinating Council be expanded to include formal representation in its group from the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education and that it consider subcommittee representation for other Job Training Partnership Act, Title IV programs, such as the Job Corps, Native American and Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers programs operating in the State. (p. 82)_

* _That the Interagency Coordinating Committee be encouraged to sponsor and prepare an Employment and Training Directory and a periodic Interagency Coordination Newsletter. (p. 82)_

* _That the Division of Employment and Training and the Division of Vocational Education follow-up initiatives to provide in-service workshops on the Job Training Partnership Act for all of the Vocational Education Regions in the State. (p. 82)_

* _That the State Job Training Coordinating Council consider including in its official Performance Standards quantifiable measures for effective coordination with elements for performance fashioned from both the law, regulations, Governor's Goals and Objectives, and other measures developed by the Interagency Coordinating Committee, and that this new state standard be legitimized through applied incentives and sanctions within the Council's discretion. (p. 90)_

* _That the State Board of Education, State Board of Community Colleges, and the State Job Training Coordinating Council jointly sponsor an annual conference on vocational education coordination which would highlight exemplary projects of_

coordination, increase dialogue between service providers, and identify issues of common concern. (p. 91)

* That the State Board of Education and the State Job Training Coordinating Council review the organizational structure, planning, administration and coordination of 8% setaside funds with a view toward appropriate measures to strengthen planning and coordination of these important setaside funds with other actors in the employment and training community. (p. 93)

SECTION 21

The world would probably function satisfactorily with the least effort required to get things done.

But what would happen to inventions, brotherhood, and sisterhood?

Extra effort, going *beyond* what necessarily *has* to be done: this is what brings about technological breakthroughs and survival for victims of natural disasters.

We could motivate and encourage extra effort by recognizing and rewarding excellence.

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO URGE LOCAL PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES, RESPECTIVELY, TO CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A "NATIONAL VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL HONOR SOCIETY" AT EACH INSTITUTION.

Adopted on May 19, 1989

Currently in North Carolina, one public secondary school and three community colleges have established a "National Vocational-Technical Honor Society" at their respective institutions. This is commendable as the "National Vocational-Technical Honor Society" has been developed based upon the model of the National Beta Club. In fact, in developing the "National Vocational-Technical Society," the original documents that were used in establishing the Beta Club were reviewed. Both organizations, the Beta Club and the "National Vocational-Technical Society," were begun in South Carolina. It should be known, however, that one public secondary school in North Carolina did have a "National Vocational-Technical Society," but has since dropped out of the Society.

In making this recommendation, a brochure about the "National Vocational-Technical Honor Society" as well as its Constitution and Bylaws and its bulletin entitled "the Artisan" were reviewed. The information in these publications provided support for the recommendation of this paper. Moreover, it may be instructive to know that as of May 4, 1989, in the State of Virginia, there were nine (9) chapters; in the State of Tennessee, there were nineteen (19) chapters, and in the State of South Carolina, there were fifty-one (51) chapters.

Because over 300,000 students in the state's public secondary schools are enrolled in vocational education courses each school year, taught by the third largest number of teachers in grades 7-12 who are vocational education teachers, and because the major purpose of each and every community college institution is to provide vocational and technical education, the following is recommended:

THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO URGE LOCAL PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES, RESPECTIVELY, TO CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A "NATIONAL VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL HONOR SOCIETY" AT EACH INSTITUTION.

NORTH CAROLINA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
530 NORTH WILMINGTON STREET - WATSON HOUSE
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27604

MEMBERSHIP 1989-90

Wayne Abele
c/o Shoney's
2156 S. Sterling Street
Morganton, NC 28655

H. Michael (Mike) Britt
409 Lawndale Drive
Winston-Salem, NC 27104

Porcius Crank, Jr.
P.O. Box 127
Harbinger, NC 27941

Tommie B. Evans
610 Council Street
Fayetteville, NC 28301

Spencer Greene
5780 Gayray Street
Clemmons, NC 27012

Mamie Gunter
Route 16, Box 139 A-3
Goldsboro, NC 27530

Eddie Owen
Route 1, Box 382
Pisgah Forest, NC 28768

Robert Pearson
Route 3, Box 6
Carthage, NC 28327

E. Thomas Satterfield
6233 Trowbridge Road
Wilmington, NC 28402

Bruce Shore
Route 3, Box 760
Dobson, NC 27017

Jefferson B. Strickland
213 SE Blvd.
Clinton, NC 28382

Robert N. Weatherly
Route 1, Box 247
Hamlet, NC 28345

Charlie Wiygul
7509 Haymarket Lane
Raleigh, NC 27609

Dr. E. Michael Latta, Executive Director
Telephone: 919/733-2064

Cost:	$722.00
Copies:	200

Not printed at state expense